

POSTAGE, Paid in Advance, 4 Cts. per No. or 16 Cts. per Year.

285.5

D2

DANVILLE REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

In Association of Ministers.

MARCH, 1868.

Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

DANVILLE, KY.

PRINTED FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOLD BY

MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,

25 WEST FOURTH STREET,

CINCINNATI.

SOLD ALSO BY WM. S. & A. MARTIN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT CARTER
BROTHERS, NEW YORK; LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON;
KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; BIBLE AND
TRACT HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1868, by JACOB COOPER, for the Association,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—INQUIRY OF HUMAN SOCIETY, By Rev. Ro. J. Breckinridge, D.D., - -	1
II.—COMMENTARY ON ECCLESIASTES, By Loyal P. Young, D.D., - - -	38
IV.—POLITICS AND THE CHURCH, By Rev. R. L. Stanton, D.D., - - -	62
IV.—CREDIBILITY OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, By Wm. T. Finlay, - - - -	121
V.—THE NEW LIFE OF THE REDEEMED, <i>Part I.</i> By S. Yerkes, - - - - -	144

THE Association having purchased the entire interest in Vol. 1, including extra Numbers, and the stereotype plates, are prepared to furnish any number of copies that may be desired. Applications for these must be made either to the Publishers, or to Rev. JACOB COOPER, Danville, Ky.



DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. I.

MARCH, 1863.

ART. I.—*An Inquiry into the True Doctrine of Human Society, Civil Government, the Magistracy, and the Citizen, as Revealed by God, with Special Reference to the State of Public Affairs in America.*

It is wonderful to note in how many ways, with what subtilty and force, and under what constancy of operation through all ages, the impulses to which our nature is subject, or those which fasten on a particular generation, or even those which distinguish a party, a sect, or a faction, diffuse themselves through the religious life of men, control and direct their moral sentiments and judgments, and determine even the bent of their rational faculties in their perceptions of positive truth divinely revealed in an unalterable form. It would be hard to deny that these impulses are often just and even heroic; to deny that, taken altogether, they constitute a class of powers capable of being used with immense effect in the general advancement of the human race; or to question that God, whose sublime prerogative it is to bring good out of evil itself, has not revealed to us the manner in which they are to be curbed, to be directed, and to be purged. In their very nature he has bounded them by laws which, in a peculiar manner, limit the force, whether for good or evil, of each one of them, and which enable the wise and courageous among the children of men to foresee their course, and to augment, to modify, or in some degree to defeat their effect. It is only at great intervals, and under the most extraordinary circumstances, that any particular one of these mighty impulses is apt to

recur. Under all circumstances they have a surprising tendency to be diverted, each one from its own course, into the course of some kindred one; and, it is common to them all, that not one of them accomplishes completely the object to which it directed the energies of man; and that every one of them is liable—after a period of torpor—to be succeeded by another heterogeneous to itself. In a very high sense, therefore, our servitude to them is voluntary; while, learning our philosophy as well as our religion from God, we admit that it is only when the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, has set us free from the law of sin and death, that we can become the masters, instead of being the slaves, of these principalities and powers, entrenched about our souls, these mighty rulers of the darkness of this world, against which the children of light wrestle well only when they have put on the whole armor of God. Contemning, therefore, whatever sets aside Christ, and his kingdom, and his Gospel, in such questions, and so that latest and shallowest form of pretentious hypocrisy, which would exclude the highest crimes against society from the list of sins against God, upon the absurd pretext that, *as crimes*, their cognizance belongs only to the State; what we propose is, by the light of divine revelation and upon the basis of Christian morality, to disentangle the elements of the true nature of society, and government, and citizenship, and to fortify the minds of men in a clear conviction of the sinfulness of all injustice and oppression by human governments, and of the destructive wickedness of the impulses to treason, rebellion, sedition, and anarchy, on the part of the citizen—both of which seem to be chronic curses of our race. And the observations we have made, while they point out the nature of the peculiar peril hanging over all American society, civil and religious, and the shape which immediate succor to it should take; disclose, in like manner, the duty of good men and the highest encouragement to its performance.

We shall not stop to prove the existence of God, the fundamental point of all such arguments as this, which we suppose no reader of these pages will question. But as soon as this is admitted it follows that we, as his dependent and responsible creatures, are bound, under the very highest sanctions, to regulate all our actions concerning which the idea of *duty* has

any place, by *his will*, so far as we know or can ascertain it. Of necessity, therefore, if human society is possible, and human government as its first and most direct product is possible, allegiance on the part of the citizen, which is his first *duty* to society and government, exists primarily in the domain of *morals*—and is to be discharged primarily, like every other duty, with reference to God. Of necessity, likewise, the rejection of any of these obvious truths obliges us, if we are capable of following a connected chain of thought, to reject all notion of duty and of God, and practically makes human society impossible, or a curse. Neither shall we stop to prove that God has provided a Mediator between himself and fallen men, and that this Mediator is his Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ; for we trust none of our readers will question this glorious truth, which is fundamental and decisive in carrying every question of *duty* one step higher than we have before placed it, by locating it in the domain of *Christian morality*. For as soon as we admit the existence of a Mediator between God and men, who is our only and all sufficient Saviour—then it is *his will*, so far as it is known, or can be ascertained by us, by which, in the view and hope of salvation, we are bound to regulate all our actions concerning which the idea of duty can arise. And having admitted all the truths set forth in the previous statement concerning God, if we now reject those set forth in this statement concerning Christ, we are obliged, if we are capable of connected thought, to separate the idea of salvation from the idea of sin—obliged to dethrone the Saviour and subvert the Christian religion. As in the former case, the attempt to screen our sin from the face of God, leads to atheism—in this latter case the attempt to hide it from the face of Christ, leads to infidelity, and most generally in the vile form of hypocritical licentiousness. When we speak of the will of God as the rule of duty to man considered as his dependent and accountable creature—and of the will of the divine Saviour as the rule of duty to man considered as fallen and guilty; and in both instances speak of that will as known to us, or as capable of being ascertained by us; we have not distinguished at all as to the manner in which that will, which is our rule of duty, is made known to us—nor urged the immense obligation resting on us, as well as our supreme interest,

to ascertain what that will is. This last topic would be pertinent here—chiefly as illustrating the very high position which the duty of allegiance due by the citizens of all states, and especially of a free commonwealth, occupies in the code both of natural and of Christian morality; and of illustrating, further, that treason and all similar offenses against society—are so far from being exempt from moral censure in the name of God and of Christ, *because* the state treats them as enormous crimes, that in effect the state is authorized to treat them in that manner, because their enormous sinfulness is the chief ground and measure of their enormous destructiveness. And the other topic—the manner in which the will that controls our actions is made known to us—need not be discussed here. Because, no matter in what, or how many ways, we come to the *knowledge* of that will—and no matter how readily we admit that it is perfectly obligatory, however ascertained, there is a way of knowing it, invested with divine certainty, and clothed with divine authority—whose existence is known, and whose use is attainable by all who will ever read these lines. The word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the infallible rule of all *duty* of every human being, whether to God, to himself, or to other human beings; and, moreover, it is the infallible rule of knowledge and belief, concerning all truth that underlies all duty required of man. We shall not stop to prove these statements; but only ask any who deny them to consider fairly what we have to say, and then decide whether it is not perfectly conclusive, upon the supposition that the Scriptures are what we have represented them to be; perfectly conclusive as against every one who admits them to be what they declare they are.

If there is anything at all taught with perfect clearness, and with absolute constancy, throughout the Scriptures, it is taught that God is the author of all the intelligence inferior to his own that exists in the universe; that every created will is subordinated to his infinite will; and that all power is an emanation from his almighty power. As it regards man, who is the head of the visible creation of God, his possession, in the form of human faculties, of the image and likeness of these divine attributes which distinguish God as an infinite personal

Spirit—distinguishes him as a finite personal spirit, and enables him, in the exercise of these faculties, in a finite manner, to understand God, to choose God, and to obey God. Two immense events have befallen man, whereby, in his fall, his ability unto these ends was first fearfully weakened, and whereby, in his restoration to God, that ability was afterward purged and restored in Christ. As the common philosophy, both moral and mental, had its origin among nations who had lost the true knowledge of God, and who knew nothing clearly either of the fall or recovery of man; all it could do was to give account of man, not as he was at first, nor as he is when restored, but as he appears in his ordinary and feeblest estate. As explained by God, and not by the disciples of a philosophy essentially heathen and necessarily erroneous, this type of existence, beginning in the divine nature, and reproduced as a shadow by its image and likeness in individual men; reappears as the cause of the very nature, and is made manifest in the vital action, of every association of men into organized society, and under every possible form of what can be called regular government. It is all, and everywhere, the manifestation of a predominant will by which the actions of the members of whatever household, or state, or church, must be regulated; the manifestation of a predominant intelligence, by which that will is interpreted and applied to those actions; the manifestation of a predominant power, by which the determinations of that will and the conclusions of that intelligence, are enforced, and the violations of them punished. Human society, the concrete of men, who are the image of God, can not be organized, nor can the functions by which its existence is manifested be performed—except in this manner—neither more nor less: nor is it at all material to the nature of the case, what form it may put on; law, and the interpretation and application of law, and the enforcement of law—will, intelligence, power; there is nothing more, nothing less. Those divine attributes which are distinctive of God, considered as an infinite personal Spirit; those human faculties which are distinctive of man, considered as a finite personal spirit, capable of understanding, choosing, and obeying God; those functions of society which are distinctive of it, considered as an ordinance of God, competent to exist and act

in an organized manner, under a government, whether domestic, social, civil, or sacred; all, when carefully considered, present that relation of intimate resemblance which the Scriptures disclose—and that relation of creation and dependence of the second, and of ordination of the third, which the Scriptures declare. This seems to us a most remarkable concatenation; a singular and most intimate proof—lying in the nature of God, of man, and of society, that the primary relations of the whole subject we are discussing are essentially moral and religious; a clear and complete explanation why the sacred Scriptures should treat so expressly and in such various ways, of those civil and political duties and relations, which are so often treated by men as if they were merely fortuitous, or depended wholly on human caprice. Remove from the sphere of human affairs, the notion of these divine attributes of which we have spoken, and what rational basis is left for human society or government—what support for them in human nature—what origin of their enormous powers—even unto life and death, and what authority for the exercise of them? On the other hand, what hope is there for personal freedom, if we give up the notion that magistrates are responsible to an infinite power for the exercise of their office; what hope of public security, where no divine will is recognized as paramount in the affairs of states and nations; what hope of the progress of society, where the light of divine intelligence is excluded? And where liberty, security, and progress are theoretically excluded, and practically impossible, we have that horrible consummation of organized wickedness and wretchedness, which it is a mockery to call human society—and impious to treat as the ordinance of God.

It is easy to understand, therefore, how, what was once a true church of God, may, by desperate and persistent apostacy, become a synagogue of Satan; and the sacred Scriptures declare to us, not only the terrible fact, but the manner in which it occurs. It is equally easy to understand, how states, once highly blessed of God, may forfeit his favor and protection, and be utterly destroyed; and, in effect, the wreck of subverted kingdoms lie thickly along the whole course of the past, and the word of God explains with great clearness the causes of all this ruin—and the particular circumstances of a

very large part of it. And the sum of all is the most thorough and absolute confutation of every notion, every principle, every allegation that tends to the exclusion of God, and morality, and religion, from the idea of the nature, the existence, and the organic action of human society and government; or that tends to exclude the idea of *duty* to God, to ourselves, and to each other, in its highest moral and religious sense, in the whole conduct of the citizen, considered as such. It is, of course, impossible even for the most elaborate treatises, to discuss and settle, in advance, all the possible contingencies incident to human actions, and all the difficulties that may arise under any line of duty: but to do so would be useless, even if it were possible, as soon as we perceive that all our actions—including those we perform as citizens, come under the idea of duty,—and perceive, further, that we have, in the sacred Scriptures, a rule of all duty at once divine and infallible. And, moreover, in proportion as our duties, from their very nature, become such, that their performance can not be adequately enforced by any outward authority—as, for example, love to God, gratitude to parents, loyalty to the commonwealth, and the like; as soon as we repudiate the only rule of their complete performance which can reach and control the conscience, we, in fact, repudiate the duty itself, and render its adequate performance by us impossible. When we consider how low is the average intelligence of mankind in their natural state, how weak are their moral sensibilities, how erroneous their moral judgments are apt to be, it is easy to see what we are to expect from them as citizens, when they are made to believe that their natural reason and impulses are their only guide in all their conduct as citizens; and easy also to see, how terrible is the responsibility of those religious teachers, who having first betrayed the interests committed to their hands as ministers of God, eagerly urge forward the ruin of their country. If the professed followers of Christ throughout the United States, had been carefully taught, and had well understood and faithfully performed, their duties, as citizens, we suppose it is perfectly certain that the long continued mutual insults and injuries of the extreme sections and factions against each other, and the opposite preposterous claims they set up, could never have become more serious than as merely

local fanaticisms; and that this nation, instead of being drenched in blood, would be now running the glorious career which God had set before it. If the professed ministers of God throughout the United States, had, as a body, proved faithful to their sacred obligations, and had firmly resisted the origin and growth and explosion of the godless fanaticisms, North and South, which are now rioting on the vitals of the nation; no one, we think, can doubt that a moral influence, so great, so pure, and so widely diffused, would have been owned and blessed of God—to the effectual curbing of those frantic impulses, under whose frightful power so large a portion of the American people seem to have lost all just conception of their responsibility to God for their conduct to each other, or to their common country, or to those glorious institutions which they all once professed to revere. And what can be said that will enable posterity to estimate, justly, the race of party leaders, and professional politicians, and self-seeking heads of factions who, during a long course of years, have habitually trifled with the destiny of this great nation, and sedulously nourished every popular misconception that promoted them, and carefully exasperated every dangerous impulse of the people that gave them notoriety? The whirlwind is upon us in all its fury, and who is competent to save us now? This, at least, is a stern consolation—that they who raised it, will perish in it. And this is a solace more becoming to men worthy to save their country, that the time is not yet passed wherein they may settle and proclaim the true and eternal principles on which alone they may look for the divine favor; and, planting themselves there, commit to other ages their justification if they fail; and if they succeed, restore with sublime faith and truth—not another, but the same Union and Constitution. It is by such men alone that we hope for deliverance. It is one set of those everlasting principles that we are now striving to make plain.

God does not leave any of his great designs concerning us, which he desires us to understand, in any obscurity. Purposing to use our race for the accomplishment of objects which exceed the individual powers of man; he creates those subtle and apparently imperishable bonds of race—whereby the whole human family lies under his providence, in a few enor-

mous masses, each mass capable of a distinct and separate use; and he explains, in his blessed Word, the origin and career of each grand division, and of most of the important subdivisions. Then he ordains and establishes and uses, in the course of his providence, that organization which we call state, kingdom, empire, commonwealth; narrating in his Word the career of the chief of them, that existed from the beginning of time to the close of the sacred canon; and recording, in the most explicit terms, his relation to all authorized human government, its relations and duties to its citizens, and their duties toward it. To adduce direct proof of these last statements, we will take some of those made by the Apostle Paul to those whom he calls the beloved of God, called to be saints, in Rome—nay in the very palace, and of the household of Cæsar, as we learn from another of his epistles, certain of them were. Nothing could give greater emphasis to the doctrine taught, than the circumstances of this utterance of it. It is a Jew of the highest standing, of the strictest sect—a Hebrew of the Hebrews, who speaks; one of the most enlightened of that wonderful race, whose nationality has survived all that has destroyed every other—and which alone of all the races of the Old World—had, from its origin, the knowledge of the true God and of eternal life. But he was, moreover, in the fallen estate of his own people, by birthright, as he declares, a Roman citizen, and that of no mean city—at the period of the highest grandeur of Rome, when the shadow of her glory and the weight of her power covered the whole earth. And more than all, he was a servant and an apostle of the Divine Redeemer, invested with power, authority and fitness, to take down the outward fabric of the church of God in its Jewish form, and to put it up in its Christian form; and to make known to it, and through it, to all generations, the will of God for the guidance of mankind. God condescends to our weakness and perversity in thus conditioning the plain and authoritative declaration of his will concerning us, in a matter so vital at once to our interests and our duties. And his inspired servant, gathering up the very essence of all past utterances of God on the subject; and deciding of necessity what were then the law of God and the duty of the creature throughout the Roman world, that is throughout the earth,

when he decided what they were at Rome; proclaimed, in the words we are about to quote—with which all Scripture agrees—the rule by which God requires human actions to be regulated, and human belief to be guided, to the end of time:

ROM. xiii: 1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. 2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. 6. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. 7. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. 8. Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. 9. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. 10. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. 11. And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to wake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. 12. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. 13. Let us walk honestly, as in the day: not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. 14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof.

This doctrine and these commandments come to us with absolute certainty, and with infinite authority: and they determine with the utmost precision the relation of God to society and government, and the mutual duties of the magistrate and the citizen. Besides the one sacred kingdom of Messiah, of which God is, in a most special sense, the author—there are and have been other kingdoms, nearly without number, in this world. These kingdoms, by means of which human society, which is an ordinance of God, has been manifested under a great variety of aspects, are themselves all ordained of God. This is declared to be true both in the abstract and in the concrete. There is no power but of God: the foundations of human society and government—are the boundless intelligence, the infinite will, and the almighty power of God. Moreover, the possible functions of society, put forth

through any forms, or by means of any body of magistracy, are inherent, and are ordained, limited, and bounded by God: and whoever, in whatever age, and by whatever means, comes to the exercise of these functions, as a magistrate, does so by the providence of God. And this distinction between the abstract idea of civil society and its ordained functions, and the concrete idea of the magistracy at any time in authority, is clearly preserved: for damnation is threatened to those who would destroy society—as if they withstood God himself—while obedience to magistrates is required because they are ministers of God, appointed for the very objects stated by the apostle, and which essentially embrace the fundamental objects of civil society. This, then, is the nature, origin, and authority of civil society, and the civil magistrate.

The duty which God requires of human governments as his ordinance, and of magistrates as his ministers, is stated with equal completeness and precision. They are to be a terror to evil works, not to good works. They are for the praise of all that do good. They must not bear the sword in vain; for, as a minister of God, the magistrate is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Both the state and the magistrate, are obliged to look to the support and prosperity of organized society, in all that relates to “custom” and “tribute”—the wide and indispensable financial necessities of this institute of God. In all this, they are entitled to due obedience, honor, fear, respect, and reverence; and this as matter of conscience, and out of the love of the citizen; the magistrate being entitled thereto, partly by reason of his office, and still further by reason of the fidelity, assiduity, and success, with which he attends continually on the things it is his duty to do. To protect, to nourish, to advance all good actions and good men; to restrain and punish all evil actions and evil men; to preserve and to guide unto its high and just ends, by righteous, wise, and necessary means, that ordinance of God which we call civil society; this is the design of civil government—the duty of civil magistrates.

The corresponding obligations laid by God upon the citizen, are still more largely stated. The apostle begins by enjoining upon every soul, obedience to all human authority to which we are subject; a command so comprehensive and so distinctive

of revealed religion, that he who is not "a law-abiding man" can not be a child of God. And he gives, at once, the very highest religious reason for the command—by a double appeal to God. And at the first pause in the divine progress of his discourse, he announces that our subjection—in opposition to all ideas of licentious and capricious freedom from restraint, is one of those overwhelming "*needs be*" which the Scriptures so often suggest; and adds two reasons why we should willingly acquiesce in the command of God; namely, *first* the certainty of punishment if we will not, and *secondly* our conscientious obligation to do so. Expanding this wide doctrine of obedience, we are forbidden to resist this ordinance of God, whether in its abstract or its concrete, under the double threat of damnation—and of the magistrate—as before explained; it is shown that if we would escape fear of the law and the ruler, we must do good and not evil; we are warned that, as God's minister, the civil magistrate must cherish us—or must punish us—as we are good or evil—that is obedient or disobedient; he commands us to discharge all our dues and obligations, of whatever kind, to the State, to the law, to the magistrate, and to all men—to do this in a frame of mind responsive to the duties we owe—to make conscience of doing it—to do it in strong affection—to do it as duty pertaining unto our salvation—as those who cast off all the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light—nay, who put on the Lord Jesus Christ!

Without deeming it necessary to cite other passages of Scripture, to confirm and illustrate the one we have printed, and briefly analyzed, to a certain extent; we must say that this passage of God's Word seems to us to put the relation of civil society, of the magistrate, and of the citizen, to God, and to each other, in such a light that men must deny the authority of the word of God, or be totally ignorant of what it teaches on the subject we are discussing, or be perfectly reckless in what they advance or accept; before the follies, the heresies, and the enormities, which signalize our generation, could ever have gained acceptance as a justification of the sins against God, and the crimes against society, under which the land groans. We shall not, however, break the continuity of this inquiry, in order to expose those fatal delusions.

Human society, then, is a determinate institute ordained of God, whose safety and perpetuity he has hedged around with the most precise commands, and the severest threats. Civil government in the abstract, which is ordained of God in a secondary manner, is the necessary result of the determinate nature of society; a result which is inevitable, upon the organization and organic action of society. And a body of magistracy—(whether all the freemen as in a small democracy, or the sovereign in an empire, or anything between the two)—are ordained of God to constitute the government, practically; and are brought into power, under his special providence. The determinate functions of society are precisely and scientifically assignable; and consist of the exercise of its will (law-making); the exercise of its intelligence (judicial exposition of laws, rights, duties); and the exercise of its power (executive enforcement of law). Nor is it of any consequence, how variously these functions may be performed, united, or divided, so far as concerns the absolute nature of the case: it is still society, still a government, still a magistracy. Society itself being, so to speak, the concrete of man, these inherent functions of society, are identical in their essential nature, with the corresponding faculties in man; namely, that intelligence by which he knows God, that will by which he chooses God, and that power by which he obeys God. And man himself, being a created image and likeness of God, these human faculties are shadows of those infinite attributes of God, which distinguish him as a personal Spirit; namely, his intelligence which is the source of all other intelligence—his will which is supreme throughout the universe, and conformity to which is the measure of all perfection—and his power which is omnipotent, and the source of all other power, and the cause of all secondary causes, from eternity to eternity. We therefore clearly see how God, making known to us his ordination of human society, makes a distinction between his relation to the abstract and the concrete; that is, to society itself, and to the magistracy; which distinction we have before pointed out. We see, also, how the allegiance of the citizen, if due to the *magistrate only*, would stand on a widely different ground from that it occupies when considered due to *society itself*. We see, also, how society itself is necessarily supreme over every

species of magistracy, and over all forms and kinds of particular institutions, administered by any sort of magistracy. We see, also, how an actual government and magistracy stand related to society, in widely different ways, when on one hand the government exists under a constitution solemnly enacted by society, and the magistracy is chosen by society, or when on the other, society has never given more than an implied consent, if any consent at all, either to one or the other. And, finally, we see how, in a free commonwealth, with such institutions, and such a magistracy as exist with us, society, and government, and magistracy are so nearly related and identified, that forcible resistance to the government or the magistracy is more difficult to be distinguished from resistance to society itself; while rebellion against the constitution, or deliberate subversion of its authority, in any way whatever, whether by the magistrate or the citizen, must be considered as next in atrocity to that direct attack on society itself, which God has so strictly forbidden. There is, however, an aggravation even of this, under our constitutions, which we will explain in another connection.

We have incidentally mentioned the kingdom of God in this world, which, from its adorable Head, is called the Messianic Kingdom—from the mode in which it exists under the power of the Holy Spirit is called the New Creation—and from its members and their relation to the Saviour is called the Church of Christ. Under its present form, the church militant is a visible society made up of the professed disciples of Christ—and being a society of human beings is subject to the same inherent laws, and is invested with the same organic functions, that we have pointed out in the case of civil society. The objects of the existence of this society, however, are different from, and paramount to, those for which civil society is ordained; and God has, therefore, limited and bounded the exercise of its organic functions, and regulated the powers and duties of its office-bearers, and ordained the government in the hands of these office-bearers—by divine command—in a manner suitable to the particular nature and end of this society. It is striking, and highly illustrative of what has been said before, to compare the Christian and the civil institutes with each other. In the former, the essential sovereignty

is in the Lord Jesus Christ, not in the society itself as in the latter; so that whereas the will of the civil society is made known by its laws for the regulation of the conduct of its citizens—the will of the Christian society is swallowed up in the will of God, made known in the sacred Scriptures, and its legislative function is suppressed. With regard to the judicial function of society, it is in full exercise in the Christian as in the civil commonwealth; the difference being in the subject matter of its exercise, the civil interpreting and applying its own laws, the Christian interpreting and applying only the law of God. Touching the executive function, the same state of case exists as in the judicial function; but with some peculiarities. For, in civil society, the execution and enforcement is each complete after its manner, while in Christian society, as the authority of all decisions depends on their being in conformity with the will of God, so their efficacy depends upon the power of the Holy Spirit. And as to the form that civil society may put on, in the nature of government and institutions—an immense latitude is allowed by God to civil societies—though the one he himself ordained for his ancient people, was singularly free: while, according to our apprehension, he has left no latitude at all to Christian society, as to the fundamental nature of its government and institutions—but has ordained them himself, in the nature of a free spiritual commonwealth. It will be seen at once that the jurisdiction of the Christian commonwealth is purely moral and spiritual, extending to everything concerning which the idea of *duty* exists—and just so far as that idea goes; while its appeal being to God and the human conscience—the right of private judgment is necessarily sacred—and every one who sees fit to take the risk, may leave the church, and adjourn over his case to the bar of God, and the day of judgment. From the nature of civil society, no such right of private judgment can exist, in such a way as to be peacefully operative; for its common exercise would render the existence of civil society impossible, by arresting the temporal effects of all its acts—whereas there can be no other but temporal effects from any of its acts. We can easily see that paramount obedience to God, may make it our *duty* to refuse obedience to wicked laws of man; but it is a perversion of terms and of sense to call this a *right*, in any other

sense than that we have a right to do our duty; and it is absurd to talk about this Christian duty of obeying God rather than man, being a natural right, much less a civil right, in whose discretionary exercise, treason, rebellion, and anarchy cease to be either sins or crimes. It will be easily seen, also, how essentially demoralizing and licentious all that teaching is, which releases civil society from the obligation of making obedience to the known will of God concerning its own nature and acts—the rule of all its conduct; and which releases the government and the citizen, or either of them, from the obligation of enforcing and obeying the fundamental institutions of the particular society, and all laws made in accordance with them. But perhaps the most senseless, immoral, and destructive part of such abominable teaching, is that which aims to silence the Church of God as a universal teacher of moral duty—and to strip her of the very essence of her mission, as the witness for Christ. God has made her the light of the world: these men would put out her light: do they desire that, in the gross darkness, sin and crime might hold carnival together? God has made her the salt of the earth: these men would rob her of her savor: can they wish that every temporal interest of man might perish in anarchy—that all by which life is made a blessing, might rot in licentiousness?

Holding carefully to the distinctions we have pointed out—and to the clear statements of the Scriptures, which we have printed and expounded on previous pages, we avoid many perplexing questions, by bearing in mind, that the divine doctrine of society, of government, and of the citizen, delivered by the great apostle, is not laid down by him simply as a theory upon which a world or even a nation may be started; but is propounded, with divine authority, as an exposition of an actual world, full of nations in complete and long continued possession and exercise of the things of which he taught. As if he had said, concerning these things which are, in effect, common to the human race, this is what God has done; and this is what he has always required and will always require—and this is the significance of the whole matter. Man can not help being of some race, and community, and country, any more than he can help being human. They are

a part of each individual's earthly existence. And however variable some of the elements may appear to be in reality, they are as permanent as the human race is, in this world. It is simply impossible for any one to change his race; and the numbers of human kind that ever changed their country or their nation, bear no assignable proportion to the numbers who do not; and all who do, bear with them, of necessity, whatever their race has made them—and transfer, to the utmost of their ability, and transmit to other ages, all the characteristics of the home and the institutions they left behind. Nor are there any deeper, or more universal, or more ennobling impulses of our nature than profound sympathy of race, and fervent love of country, and earnest veneration of ancestral institutions. Nor is there a surer human guaranty for the preservation of whatever attainments the human race can make, than the tenacity with which it cherishes these impulses. We see, therefore, that God does not ordain the things whereof we speak, to be transient and inconstant. Nationalities are the growths of many generations; ours is the growth of two and a half centuries on this continent, and of a thousand previous years in the old world. God did not ordain society in such a way, that they who compose it might lightly cast themselves loose from it. And the providence of God has hedged us about with such innumerable difficulties in the way of all disloyalty, that in ordinary times, and in well-ordered states, its wide existence may be said to be impossible. And so strong is the natural instinct which God has implanted in us, fitting us for the ordinances which he has fitted for us—that sound-hearted men are obliged to be deluded with a pretext of loyalty before they allow themselves to be disloyal. We are satisfied that the delusion that, under our complex system of government, our supreme allegiance is due, and our supreme affections should be given, to the states of which we are citizens, rather than to the nation which those states unitedly constitute—lies at the bottom of most that can be extenuated, in the present rebellion. But we need not pursue these ideas, just now, beyond what is necessary to direct attention to the proof which God has laid in our very nature, confirmatory of the stability of his ordinances—and the perpetuity of the ties that bind us to them—and the immorality and untruthfulness

of all opposite interpretations. For the evil which is raging around us, is by so much the more astonishing and atrocious, as the white population of this country is altogether the most homogeneous and enlightened that ever existed in as great numbers, in any free nation. Nor do we suppose a single faithful American citizen lives, who did not once believe that our country was out of the reach of the particular calamities which have overtaken her, and free from all danger of the particular form of ruin which now threatens her. How terribly, then, does it import us, to understand the true remedy for such misery!

Where a community exists, and is manifested in a way that God allows; where the nature and form of its institutions are also such, as in his wide indulgence to us, he sanctions; and where the magistracy are in power by the ordinary and established action of society, under the controlling providence of God, the regular and lawful action of the government is under the special sanction of the Almighty, and all resistance to that action, by arms, is equally a folly, a sin, and a crime. This was our condition; it is the ordinary condition of all communities, even partially civilized, in all ages; and internal peace, security, and order are the great blessings which ordinarily attend it—all of which are temporarily forfeited, and put at permanent risk, by every forcible attempt at change. These forcible attempts, from within, have marked every age, and have occurred in every nation—now, finally, among ourselves. In general, the judgment of mankind concerning them, has depended more on their failure or success than on their nature and objects; and succeeding ages have not possessed the means of revising many of these judgments. Great nations have generally survived them, and grown greater; weak states have generally perished, and fallen victims, by reason of them, to states that were more powerful. Upon the whole, the fate of all seditions and rebellions, taken together, has been disastrous to the human race—contributing little to its permanent advancement, and making no compensation, by the evils they may have destroyed, for those they inflicted. If a few signal exceptions may be found, they will turn out, on careful examination, to have been really national movements—or outbursts of long continued struggles between

heterogeneous races—rather than revolts against society, or seditious risings against established governments. Of the former kind may be said to be the English Revolution of 1688, which saved both the nation and the laws, and the American Revolution of 1776 which gave organic life to our nationality, which is now sought to be destroyed; and of the latter kind, the forcible separation of Belgium and Holland, which the whole power of Europe had absurdly forced to unite. We have before our eyes, in the case of France, a great nation, starting with a bloody and ferocious revolution, more than seventy years ago, and after passing through every possible form of government—including three royal dynasties—landing in an Imperial Despotism. Did the drenching her land in blood, did the decimating her population by war, by the public executioner, and by private butcheries—did the conquest of the greater part of Europe, and then her own subjugation—did her standing menace against the peace of the world, and the independence of nations; did all that has occurred since 1789, tend, in the least, to secure France against further revolutions, after diligently following revolution, as a pursuit, for three-quarters of a century? Or, to draw instruction from our own recent experience, can any wise and just man doubt that it would have been ten thousand times better for this nation, and for every real interest of it, if this revolt and civil war had never occurred? Or, can he see, nay, can he conjecture, any possible result of things as they now stand, that can ever compensate for the mischief already done—the misery already inflicted? We see, therefore, that it is of the ordination of God, and is in the order of nature and society, as well as providence, that the progress of mankind is not the achievement of armed factions; that institutions are not ameliorated by sedition and anarchy; that revolt, and revolution, and treason, have no tendency to promote reform, much less to establish security, freedom, or civilization. These are outrages—not remedies. Outrages abhorrent to society as ordained of God—to every end for which civil government exists—to every interest, and every right, and every duty of the citizen. Nor are there any obligations binding on magistrates higher than that they forbore to drive men to such extremities—by folly, by injustice, or by

oppression; and that they exert the whole power with which they are clothed, to protect society against such destructive crimes.

Whatever tendency to decay and ignorance may be supposed to exist in a fallen race, when left to itself, the actual posture of mankind is not one in which they are thus left to themselves; but, on the contrary, is one in which boundless elements of progress exist profusely. It is their right, their interest, their duty to profit by this condition: and that in regard to their civil institutions, as zealously as in regard to anything else. We have already shown that God has placed civil society in a certain condition of supremacy over its own institutions—and has allowed it a latitude of choice, which he has denied to the corresponding Christian community, in determining the form of civil government—as democratic, or republican, or monarchical, or mixed. In practice, all forms, and nearly all modifications of them all, may be said to have been chosen, or at least acquiesced in, by society; and the judgment of the wisest and truest lovers of human progress, would probably be, that there are conditions of the human race to which each form is most suitable. To make, at will, a transition from one of these forms to any other—is a divine right of society itself; in opposition to the singularly absurd claim of the divine right of some particular form, or dynasty, to hold society in endless subjection. And all forcible attempts on the part of the existing form, or reigning dynasty, or magistrates in power, or portions of the community, to prevent society from making the transit it desires—is one form of that resistance to society which God has expressly forbidden. And as the *supreme* allegiance of the citizen is due, neither to the form, nor to the dynasty, nor to the magistrate, nor to any faction, but to the commonwealth itself—the real sovereign; it is his duty not only to acquiesce in the determination of that true sovereign to make the transit—but also to resist every attempt that may be made to defeat the execution of that purpose. If war occurs in the progress of such lawful and authorized acts on the part of the sovereign community—it is just of the same character as war undertaken to subjugate society in any other way; and armed enforcement of these supreme rights of civil society, accords with the will

of God, and is even more highly the duty of the magistrate and the citizen, than armed enforcement of ordinary laws. The only difficulty is the speculative one—as to what really constitutes society in this supreme aspect—and as to the means by which its supreme will must be made known. The more complete the development of society becomes, the more completely this difficulty vanishes; and we have the remarkable fact, that God's ordinances concerning these immense interests of man, are not merely the only clear and comprehensive disposition ever made of the whole subject—but they become more practical and more fundamental, the higher is the advancement of society;—more readily and effectually applicable to the complex problems of the nineteenth Christian century, than to the simple ones of the first Christian century, or the rude ones of the earliest historic century before Christ. By whatever means it can be ascertained, who is a citizen in any particular country, by the same means it is made certain, what is the body in which the legal sovereignty resides. It is a question not without difficulty, in most civilized countries, how far the safety of the state will permit, the citizens and the adult male population to be numerically identical; or how far, on the other hand, that safety will allow a ruling class to press—without fatal reaction—the disfranchisement of the lower classes. And certainly it is a question, which all disfranchised classes in all civilized states may well ponder, how far they are allowed by God to proceed in forcing their enfranchisement; or if they be, as they generally are, the numerical majority, how far they are to be justified in vindicating their claim to be the very society which God has ordained—and whose rights the privileged classes have usurped. These are all questions, however, which lie on that extreme verge, where the imperfect stage of human progress, makes it difficult for complete truth to have free scope. They are questions which have no relevancy to American affairs; for they are settled here, by written constitutions, and by immemorial tendency in one direction. In other nations, we are furnished with a great variety of solutions of them. In France, for example, with the singular combination of universal suffrage on the part of the people, and irresponsible and nearly unlimited power on the part of the Emperor;

a combination so prolific of mischief, that even half a million of soldiers, and the gratification of every national passion by the present Emperor, may *possibly* not allow that great ruler to transmit his crown to his race. In England, we have the example of the most protracted struggle which history affords, between the mutually conflicting claims of the people, the privileged classes, and the crown, resulting in a limited monarchy, with the most distinguished aristocracy in the world, and only a fraction of the adult male population enfranchised, and the sovereignty nominally vested in the popular branch of an omnipotent Parliament—but really in the public opinion of that whole English population, which, upon extremity, is the fiercest and most turbulent in Europe. Yet no one can compare the France and England which the Romans subdued, with the France and England of the present day, without confessing a progress as remarkable as was ever made, under difficulties as great as were ever surmounted. And as we ponder such examples of the triumphs which even the imperfect exercise of the powers inherent in society may win—and which even the insufficient application of the divine principles we are discussing may make imperishable; we ought to rise, with a sublime confidence, above our immediate perils and calamities. It is not by fatal concessions to armed destroyers of our national life—nor by equally fatal acquiescence in the destruction of our constitutional liberty and security—that we dare hope for triumph. It is by a faithful adherence to the truth God has taught us, and by a true obedience to the commands he has laid on us, with respect to the very matters now hanging on wager of battle; that our courage, our fortitude, our faithfulness to our trust, our justice, our wisdom, our heroic moderation, may be relied on as the sure means of such a triumph as God will approve, and all coming ages magnify!

We have spoken, in a former paragraph, of certain heinous offenses against society being aggravated, when the provisions of our American constitution, which remove all occasion, and nearly all temptation, to committing them—are considered. And in the last paragraph, we have spoken of the determinate and sovereign settlement in those constitutions—of the difficulties, which, everywhere else, and in all ages, have proved such formidable obstacles to society in passing from one form

of government to another, or even in liberalizing and perfecting their institutions, without changing the general nature of the government. This state of fact appears to us to be so important, and to place the duty of the citizen of a free commonwealth, organized on the principles of all our American constitutions, on such a basis; that all irregular opposition to a fair government, and all forcible resistance of just laws, assume a turpitude unknown in other countries; nay, that violence on the part of the citizen, which might be excused, or even justified, under other forms of government, does not admit of any extenuation under ours. For let it be remembered, that the constitution of the United States is the formal and sovereign will of the people of the United States, deliberately expressed, solemnly ratified, and steadfastly adhered to for nearly three-quarters of a century. And let it be further remembered, that the nation not only had, what all men admit to be an absolute right, but, as we think we have proved, a divine right, to make that constitution, to establish that close and perpetual union under it, and to set up the form of government, and to ordain the magistracy which is created by it. Therefore, these things are all unalterable and supreme, each in its sphere, while they continue to be the last sovereign expression of the will of the nation—that is, until the nation shall, with equal formality and distinctness, make known its sovereign will to change one, or other, or all—the Constitution—the Union—the Government—the Magistracy. Now, if the sovereign acts had ceased at this point, the indefeasible right of this society, as of all others, still remained, no doubt, to pass onward, at whatever time society should resolve to do so, and by new formal and sovereign acts, equal in dignity and force with those formerly performed, to do anything society may lawfully do, under the ordination of God. But, in attempting this, or even in attempting much lower changes in its institutions, under such circumstances, which, vague as they might be accounted, are much more precise than the general conditions of societies in which important changes have been attempted; we should have been obliged to run the gravest risks, and to encounter the most serious dangers. But our sovereign acts did not cease at the point indicated. On the contrary, the federal constitution—like all our American

constitutiona—makes express provision for its own amendment, and points out how this shall be done. This natural right of society of which men speak so much—this divine ordinance of God which we have proved—has been taken by the fathers of American liberty, and made a civil and constitutional right, and its orderly exercise secured by exact provisions. From that moment it is *voting*, and not *fighting*, that should determine all things. From the beginning of time till that moment, it had been fighting and not voting—which had determined all changes in human society. We are in the midst, therefore, of the most aggravated treason of which it is possible to conceive, from a speculative point of view; and practically so atrocious is it, that without a pretext having, originally, even an appearance of justification for attacking anything by force—everything—society itself, the national life, the constitution of the nation, the union of the states, the government existing in the country, the laws made in pursuance of the constitution, and all the magistracy in whose hands is the making, the exposition, and the enforcement of those laws—everything is set upon with a fury never exceeded in the annals of mankind. And to make the event utterly disgraceful to the age in which it occurred, two of the three greatest nations in the world—England and France—have manifestly desired the success of a treason so detestable; and, claiming to be at the very summit of Christian civilization, have shown an eagerness for the failure of our great destiny, which would have been shameful in the most debased peoples, an eagerness, as yet hardly kept in bounds by the enormous force this nation has shown itself capable of putting forth, and which they will not restrain a moment after they believe its flagrant indulgence may be gratified without extreme peril. May God reward them, in his good time and way!

It is, perhaps, important to clear up somewhat further the chief idea developed in the preceding paragraph—and some others of very great importance closely related to it. As we have already said several times, God has allowed very great latitude to society, as to the mode in which its inherent functions should make themselves manifest; and it can not be denied that, while his Gospel may have free scope under every possible form, so also every possible form is capable of being

turned to the exclusion of that Gospel; any more than it can be denied, that the personal knowledge of God unto salvation, is capable of reaching the individual soul, in every condition in which a human being can exist in this world; and we may add, the proportion of human conditions which men visited with divine grace must afterward forsake, or lose the grace of God, is extremely small compared with all possible conditions, whether we take the Word of God simply, or that Word as expounded by his gracious dealings with men, as the rule of judgment. What is the best form human society can put on, in order to answer best the ends of its divine institutions, may, perhaps, be answered well enough by saying, that form is best for each particular society which will most effectually put the powers of the state in the hands of those most fit to exercise them, and will the most permanently keep them there. Not long ago, nearly all Americans would have said, the freer the form a people can be trusted with, the better: and one of the terrible evils of our present condition, is the doubt that it seems to cast over the security and permanence of free institutions—and the pretext thus afforded for arresting the progress of personal liberty in all countries. We suppose, however, that even yet, few will be found anywhere, mad enough to deny that free institutions, such as are presented under the constitution and laws of the United States, are allowed by God to those who desire them. This is all the admission our present argument requires. Under such institutions, the whole body of the magistracy is elected by the greater part of the citizens—and the continued existence of the institutions of the country, in the form at any time presented by them, depends upon the adherence to them, in that form, of the great body of the citizens. Now, if any portion of the citizens of a free state, less than the majority—nay, we might say less than the constitutional majority—is at liberty to revolt against the magistrates, to defy the laws, to overthrow the constitution, to break up the national life, to subvert society; their right to do so, under such government, is a conclusive proof that free governments are incompatible with the existence of society, and in opposition to the will of God; for God has forbidden such actions in that society ordained by him! It is far more; it is incontestable proof

that no form of government, except unlimited, hereditary despotism, pure and simple, is possible, consistently with the rights of man, the nature of society, or the will of God. The right of five millions to despise and subvert the rights of twenty-two millions—is the right of two to treat eight in the same way—and still more clearly the right of the stronger of the two to treat the weaker in the same way. It is the dogmatic establishment of *force*, as the only rule of right; the dogmatic establishment of human passion and caprice as the sole direction of force; the dogmatic establishment of uncontrollable violence, as the final result of all human experience, and all possible human attainment! And we confidently assert, that it is impossible to acknowledge the right of secession, by the exercise of which every rebel state commenced the disintegration of American society; without terminating, as a moral result, in simple atheism, as to any assignable relation of God to human society; and without terminating in zero-*nihi*l, anarchy, the utter impossibility of society, as the result, both scientific and practical, of human rights and human authority, brought face to face. This is the residuum we get, when we suppress the sublime idea of *duty*, in the maturing of our principles, and the ordering of our lives, touching these vast subjects. And when fraud, and terror, and violence, are the means by which the first step—the secession—is taken; the case presented is, not a delusion, but a conspiracy; and the horror of its conclusion, is responsive to the atrocity of its beginning.

It is in vain that the force of these truths is sought to be broken, or evaded, by claiming that under our system of government the paramount allegiance of the citizen is due to the particular state, and not to the nation; and is due to the nation at all only through the state; and only so long as the state shall require the citizen to render it. Of the three propositions which make up this argument, and terminate in the conclusion that each state may secede when it sees fit, the two former might possibly be true, while the third one, and the conclusion, would remain utterly false. If it were true that each state was sovereign and independent before it became one of the constituent elements of the nation; and further true, that its sovereign act adhering to the nation, was

the only original ground of the allegiance of its citizens to the nation; that sovereign act, when performed, is *functus officio*, final, and irrevocable by any subsequent act of the particular state; and whatever allegiance was due to it, is irrevocably transferred to the nation; and every attempt of the particular state to undo its former sovereign act by secession, or otherwise, is not only immoral and traitorous, but is utterly absurd, seeing that its last act of paramount sovereignty, was to merge that separate sovereignty in the paramount national sovereignty. But both the preceding statements of the proposition on which the secession conclusion rests—are utterly destitute of truth, whether historical, legal, or theoretical. There is not a state that is, or ever was, in the American Union, that ever existed for one moment, as a separate state clothed with paramount sovereignty; not one that ever existed as a *state* at all, otherwise than as one of the United States; just as there never was any such nation as the United States, except as constituted of sovereign states—those very states that issued unitedly the Declaration of American Independence in 1776, together with the numerous territories which have been admitted into the Union as states, by act of Congress, at their request. These facts are just as certain, as that there is an American people in the world. And the existing constitution of the United States, being based upon these undeniable historic truths, recognizes them all—is made expressly in the sense of all of them and of the consequences which flow from them, and is neither intelligible nor capable of execution, except on the supposition of their reality. That constitution is on its face, and in its form, a *government not a treaty*. It is one nation, settling its institutions by the will of its people; not many nations, arranging terms and conditions of peace, amity, and alliance. By it, the peculiar nature, and the boundaries of the national powers and duties, are determined; and the peculiar relations of the nation and the states, to each other, and to the people, are defined. And settling forever every question upon which such pretensions as we are now exposing, could be rationally based, it expressly declares that constitution, and the laws enacted, and the treaties made in pursuance of it, to be the supreme law of the land—naming state constitutions and laws as nullities when

they conflict with this supreme law; expressly prohibits to the states, the exercise of those functions which are inseparable from supreme sovereignty—such as the power to declare war, to make peace, to coin money, to make treaties—and such like; and expressly vests these, and similar powers inseparable from paramount sovereignty, in the government of the United States. It seems to us that nothing could be clearer. And yet this pretext of paramount state authority—shown to be totally absurd in its conclusion, even if its main terms were true, and those main terms shown to be totally false; has probably done more harm in confusing the minds of men, in becoming an instrument in the hands of despotic and unscrupulous local power, in furnishing to the timid and time-serving a decent excuse, and in affording unreasonable scope to state pride and local attachments; than could be conceived by those who have not had occasion to observe its immense diffusion, and the confidence with which it is always urged. From it also springs the chief pretext used by disloyal teachers of morals in the loyal states, who as a body are fearfully responsible for the errors and sins of the times, whereby the church of God is attempted to be silenced, as the moral guide of mankind. They put it thus: the whole question of this civil war, is merely one of construction of the federal constitution; does it or does it not allow secession? which being a question purely of political criticism, concerning which the church does not know the mind of God, has no authority from him to speak. These evils the triumph of the nation should cure, and put an end to the doctrine and practice of secession, and to the follies and miseries which follow in its course. But that very triumph may lead to an opposite evil, not less surely fatal at last, than secession itself; and means have already been resorted to, in the alleged impatience to hurry that triumph, and make it signal, which may make the effects of that evil both sudden and vehement. It is as strictly true that there is no American nation except as it is constituted of these states, as it is that there are no American states except as they constitute this nation. The nation has no more right to expel, or destroy a state, or usurp its rights, than a state has to expel or secede from the nation, or usurp its rights. In one respect the power of the state is more plenary, than

that of the nation; for the nation has no power, under its present constitution, except what that constitution gives, and what is incidental thereto; whereas all the powers inherent in society are given by the state constitutions, except so far as, by themselves, or by the federal constitution, any powers are withheld. While their sovereignty is not paramount, as we have shown, their scope is far wider and more varied. This is our system: the wisest, the noblest, the nearest to the double perfection of immense public force, united with the highest personal security and freedom—ever produced in the mere course of human progress. There are ideas afloat among eminent leaders of the party now in power—which are directly subversive of this system of government; directly incompatible with that indispensable element of it, which is contributed by the power, the dignity, the sovereignty, and the security of the states. And these ideas have to a large extent, hardened into acts of Congress—and matured into avowed principles, for the conduct of the war; while others, clearly related to them, are habitually advocated in both houses of Congress, in the most important state papers, and in many ably-conducted newspapers. The triumph of these ideas, is a wholly different thing from the triumph of the nation in this war. The nation may, we trust will, triumph in this war, in defiance of these ideas. But there will remain the necessity of another national triumph over these ideas—no matter in what posture they may then be found; or the nation must take the risk of a future career radically incompatible with the federal constitution; and therefore radically different from all its past career.

It is now well known that the outbreak of the civil war, preceded by successive acts of secession on the part of many states, had long been contemplated, and awaited only a favorable conjuncture of affairs. It was a conspiracy, matured through a long course of years, pointing to the division of the nation, and the erection of a new nation intended to include, if possible, all the slave states, and to extend itself indefinitely south and west over the Spanish and Indian country, and seaward over as many of the West India islands as might be possible. There can be no doubt, that it was designed to make negro slavery universal in the new nation; but that is widely

different from saying, that slavery was the original, or only serious, cause of the conspiracy; widely different from saying, that the body of the slaveholders favored the conspiracy before it broke out into secession, or favored the secession because the secession was on account of slavery; widely different from saying, that slavery must be destroyed, as a condition precedent to the restoration of the Union. So far as the slave states may have had any idea of the insecurity of slave property, under the federal constitution, arising from the long, persistent, and deeply offensive movements against it at the North, beginning with the opposition to the admission of Missouri in 1819, and extending over forty years, to the accidental triumph of the republican party in 1860; those states had resented, and resisted, and triumphed over those northern movements, with great political skill and hardihood, and a growing extravagance in their demands—which rendered it impossible they could have doubted—that the republican triumph of 1860, was accidental and temporary, perfectly controllable during the four years of power by that party, if the South had not seceded, and politically certain of being reversed in 1864, by any one of numerous possible combinations of the whole fifteen slave states, with a certain number of the nineteen free states. What is very certain is, that the American people have never set the seal of their approbation, to the *extreme* demands made in the interest, either of slavery or anti-slavery; nor do we believe they ever will do either. They rebuked, and for the time crushed, the party that seduced the administration of Mr. Buchanan, besides many other iniquities, into the support of the wildest pro-slavery claims; and, whoever is observant of the effects produced on the public mind, everywhere, by Mr. Lincoln's proclamations of September 22d and 24th, 1862, and January 1st, 1863, and the various acts of the Congress which has just terminated, which sustain the principles of those proclamations—can hardly doubt the conclusion which the American people will announce in 1864. This, at least, is certain—that neither the union of the states, under any constitution whatever, nor the preservation of peace, liberty, security, public order, under the present constitution, is permanently possible—after the American people shall have deliberately approved the abuse of the national

power either to the maintenance and spread of slavery in America, or to the universal liberation of the negro slaves, and their elevation to civil and social equality with the whites. It is certainly very deplorable, that the present policy of the country toward slavery should appear to furnish the rebel states with a terrible proof in support of the main reason attributed to them for seceding; and that this proof should be created by the acts of the very party whose access to power offered the occasion of the revolt.

Posterity will judge whether apprehensions of the security of their slave property, was the cause of their secession; we think, and on several occasions have endeavored to show, that they were not in more than a slight degree, if at all. Posterity will, also, judge whether, if they were, the present policy of the federal government does not go far to prove their apprehensions may have been just—although the mode which they took to obtain security, was at once sinful and absurd; while, if they were not, and the present national policy admits of some other explanation, posterity may well marvel that the safety of so great a nation could be supposed to depend on official acts, the effects of which no human being could calculate, and the power to perform which, loudly and everywhere denied, no man has attempted to demonstrate—further than by wild and incoherent assertions about "*belligerent rights*." No matter what was the actual state of the case—or of apprehension about it; the mode of security sought by the seceding states—as we have abundantly shown, was wholly without excuse; and that all the more, because there were not only other and adequate means, which were peaceful and regular, as we have also shown; but, because, the successful use of *force*, in the union, and *under* the constitution, in resisting illegal violence and wrong, no matter in what sacred name they might be used, remained to them, at the last extremity. Deeming it a necessary part of this inquiry to explain that aspect of the general subject, this paragraph was needful, in order to present the point with precision, before discussing it. Before proceeding to do so, we will merely add further: *first*, that the steadfast obstinacy with which the leaders of the secession party, and the first states that seceded, refused even to listen to counsel on this subject—proved how much more deeply

their purpose rested, than upon any mere apprehensions of danger which, by remaining, they might restrain—and at the end of four years, remove; and, *secondly*, that our conviction is unshaken, that if this distinction had been adopted, which rejects secession, and asserts the right of the citizen to armed and combined self-defense against illegal violence *in* the union and *under* the constitution—the country would have been saved from the miseries of the past two years, and from the perils of its present position.

Any just consideration of the passage of sacred Scripture which we have printed and expounded, in the former part of this inquiry, shows that the duties of each party therein set forth, have relations which are direct and mutual to the other parties, all of which are enforced by the responsibility of all the parties to God. This responsibility to God is not all—but it is supreme. It exceeds all power that is not divine, either to change or release it. Whosever duty it is to evangelize the world, to administer discipline in the Church of God, and to expound truth, duty, and faith unto eternal life; it is theirs, eminently, to expound and to press upon all men, everywhere, the nature and obligation of this responsibility, along with every other we owe to God. And all communities, all magistrates, and every citizen, in the exercise of every power by the first, in the performance of every act by the second, in the whole conduct of the third, are so far disobedient to God, and so far incur his displeasure, as they lose sight of this responsibility, or intentionally disregard it. By his providence in this world, and by his sentence in the day of judgment, God undertakes to see his glory and his dominion vindicated, and the wickedness of the disobedient punished—and the obedience of the righteous abundantly blessed. Now, upon the mere statement of the case, in this aspect of it, no one can doubt that if the revealed will of God were obeyed, with a perfect heart by men, no difficulty could arise in the conduct of human affairs, beyond such as might temporarily occur through the natural ignorance or weakness of man. Moreover, it is manifest that taking our race as it is, while no man is allowed by God to do wrong with impunity—every man is allowed, nay is encouraged by God, to *suffer* wrong, to the whole extent that fidelity in his lot, and the keeping of a good

conscience toward God and toward men, will permit, before he undertakes to redress himself or others. And, finally, it is clear that as there are limits beyond which our responsibility to God does not require us to endure grievous and intolerable wrong; so, also, there are requirements which may be made of us by the civil law, or the civil magistrate, which God absolutely forbids us to comply with; as, for example, every human command which requires us to violate the command of God. We see, therefore, that by our responsibility to God, and by the express command of God, there are, at the least, two classes of cases, in the former of which *passive obedience* is not required, and in the latter of which it is forbidden. As to the form of the resistance, there is little choice left, in general, to the victim. Nor, as to the principle involved, does it make any difference, whether he perishes at the stake or triumphs on the field of battle. The grand principle we reach is, that both the doctrine of *divine right* as applied to the magistrate, and the doctrine of *passive obedience* as applied to the citizen are contrary to the Word of God, and incompatible with the safety, the purity, or the progress of that divine institute which we call society. God, in ordaining positive institutions for a fallen and depraved race, has made the irregular and effectual application of force, drawn not from the existing government or magistracy, but directly from the bosom of society; a lawful and permanent resort for the safety both of society and the citizen, under the workings of intolerable institutions, laws, or magistracy. It is a very striking result; and discloses how much closer is the bond between society and the citizen—the two permanent elements—than the bond between either of them and the particular institutions or the particular magistracy—the two transient elements of what we call the state. And we venture to express our strong assurance, that whoever will carefully compare the statements of this paragraph, with the abundant teachings of the sacred Scriptures on this important topic, will find that all we have done is to give an imperfect summary, of sound and wholesome doctrine, too little understood. We do not see how the conclusion can be resisted, that while all attempts at the destruction of American society, and our national life, are contrary to the revealed will of God—as has been proved; it is, at the same time true, that

cases might arise in which armed opposition to particular laws, or a particular body of magistracy, would be permitted, or even required, by God; and that one element of that which is inexcusable, is that it begins by renouncing the Constitution and the Union—while one element of that which, in extremity, God approves, is that it occurs in the Union and under the Constitution, and for the greater security of both.

Let us then, for a moment, consider the other aspect of these duties, and the other responsibility of those who are charged with their performance. The magistracy—the government—the administration, are responsible; the citizen is responsible; society itself is responsible. They are every one responsible to both the others. Every magistrate is responsible to some magistracy above him: every citizen is responsible to every other citizen. All are responsible to the laws of the land—to the public sentiment of the nation—to the judgment of all other nations, and to that of coming ages. The duties are among the highest that belong to this earth—the responsibility for their just performance, the widest and most varied that relates to time. But the immediate question is, when and to what extent can *force* be resorted to, according to the law of God—with regard to these mutual obligations, and this comparatively lower responsibility? The answer may be given, briefly, and in some detail. Whatever *human law* may be executed at all—may, when resisted, be executed, according to the will of God, by whatever force is necessary thereto: it is the duty of the government to have this done: it is the duty of the magistracy to do it: it is the duty of society to take care that it shall be done: it is the duty of every good citizen, each in his proper place and degree, to encourage the doing of it, and when lawfully called thereto, to assist therein. We mean, both that the mutual obligations and responsibilities of all these parties oblige them to act in the manner stated, and that these mutual obligations and responsibilities being moral as well as civil in their nature, God requires their right discharge. If this were not so, the nature of civil society is subverted, the authority of the magistrate is at an end, and the very object of law as a rule of conduct is lost. Law that has no penalty—and gives no

redress, is not law but advice; and penalties that are not, or can not be inflicted,—and redress that is never given—are mere expressions of opinion. The only possible sanction of all laws, against offenses of every description, is punishment; and the only meaning of redress by law, is the application of the force of the commonwealth, to compel the right it had commanded, and to undo or recompense the wrong it had forbidden. It seems to us, therefore, that no clearer duty was ever laid on a human being, than that laid on President Lincoln, to enforce the laws of the United States against the rebellious citizens thereof—and that laid on every good citizen to aid him in so doing. In the nature of the case, there can be but one rational ground of objection to this conclusion; namely, that those rebellious citizens had the right, when driven to extremity, to resort to force—and that they were driven to extremity. We admit that the citizen, when driven to extremity, has the right to resort to force—and will explain that right presently. But we totally deny that these rebellious citizens were driven to extremity; and that they were not, is perfectly clear from their whole conduct. For they had it completely in their power, simply by remaining as they were, to have held for four years, the balance of power in both houses of Congress; and at the end of the four years, to have turned out of power the party which their own obstinate folly, or their preconcerted treason, brought into power—and whose advent to power they call, being driven to extremity. And, further, they not only refused to use any of the regular and ordinary means of security, which must be exhausted before any one can say he is driven to extremity; but they refused to resort—if it should become necessary—to those powerful but unusual means of defense, in the Union and under the constitution, in which, long before they could have been driven to extremity, the mass of the American people would have taken sides with them, in any fair and reasonable claims they might advance. Moreover, no extremity whatever, could justify the ends for which they resorted to force. For we have abundantly proved, that human society, as such, is an ordinance of God, resistance to which he has forbidden and threatened with his high displeasure; and this was the very thing they attempted. Nothing less than the total destruction of our national life would satisfy

them; and their incessant boast is that they have accomplished that at least, whatever else may come.

But we said we would explain the right of the citizen, in extremity, to resort to force. While the ordinances of God with reference to society, government, the magistrate, and the citizen, are universal in their nature and applicability, and would be proper and effectual in their application to the whole family of man, if the whole were united into one social system; they are equally applicable and effective upon whatever smaller number of human beings, and in whatever narrower bounds, God's providence toward our race may indicate. The duties and responsibilities of which we now speak, are, therefore, liable to become, and throughout the earth now actually are, local and special, as well as mutual. It is the American citizen—and no one else—to whom the American nation owes protection and defense, of the kind now intended; and it is to the American nation—and to no other nation—that the American citizen owes the special obedience and allegiance spoken of. These great duties, thus shown to be both mutual and special, are also relative. We have shown how God has made *force* irregularly exerted by the citizen, irrespective of wicked and traitorous magistrates, and even in defiance of them, an ultimate element in the security of society; and how he makes *force* exerted by the magistrate, the regular and ordinary means, of making the functions of society accomplish, through *law*, the objects for which, chiefly, governments exist: and the question which remains is, the right, on the part of the citizen, to use *force* irregularly in his own defense, as before in defense of society. When we say the duties and responsibilities involved are special, mutual, and relative—we have already virtually decided this question. When we examine the Word of God—not only the passage we have printed, but all scripture—we see that the idea continually enforced therein, is that of covenants mutually dependent, stipulations relatively obligatory, upon the magistrate and the citizen. There can be no rational doubt, therefore, it seems to us, that the use of irregular force, by the citizen, when driven to extremity, and to whatever extent that extremity requires, is according to the revealed will of God, and consists with the duties and responsibilities he owes to God, as a member of

human society,—as well as with the lower, mutual, and relative duties and responsibilities he owes to the magistrate and the government. If we deny this great truth, we increase a thousand fold, all the dangers that beset free institutions; and increase, in like degree, the security of all evil and oppressive rulers. If we admit it, we find our conclusion fortified by innumerable statements of God's Word, and multitudes of examples not only of his providence, but of his express commands, recorded therein. If we pass into the wide domain of the history of nations, we shall find no adequate or permanent progress made by mankind, no secure possession of life, liberty, or property, except among armed peoples, who, to a loyal and law-abiding spirit, added a prompt and resolute spirit of self-vindication, which good rulers knew how to respect, and bad ones wisely dreaded. For what end does the magistrate bear the sword, if by his means life is made insecure, property has lost the protection of law, liberty has become impossible, and the most venerable and sacred institutions are abused for purposes at once vile and fatal? Whoever, and whatever, reduces the citizen to such a condition as this, *reduces him to extremity*; and whoever, and whatever, does that, is responsible for all that follows. We do not pretend to say what is the extremity beyond this, which the citizen may, if he sees fit, endure; nor to point out the extremity below this, at which he may, if he sees fit, take up arms. Such questions cover an immense field, and are surrounded with multitudes of conditions. They must be left, under all circumstances, to the responsible discretion of mankind. Under God, there at last, is the great foundation—there the great risk—the great hope of humanity. There, first or last, all terminates, as to this world—whether we will or not. And never, perhaps, did the responsible discretion of a great nation signify more; never was its deliberate and manful exercise more pregnant with immense results, than is true at this moment, with regard to the people of the United States. And never, as it seems to us, was a clearer duty laid on any human being, than that laid on President Lincoln, to prosecute this war, which we have constantly asserted was an unavoidable necessity on his part, in such a spirit of reverence for the constitution, the laws, and the rights of the citizen, as

would enable every loyal man to keep a good conscience, in lending him the most determined support.

If we have succeeded in establishing the fundamental idea on which this Inquiry has been conducted, namely, that God has revealed his will and our duty, concerning every part of the immense subject embraced in it; we have furnished the means of correcting any errors we may have fallen into, at the same time that we have pointed out, to all men, the way, at once simple and infallible, whereby they may reach and enjoy, whatever assurance is attainable by man. And if the great conclusions we have reached, in expounding, on one side the Word of God, and on the other the sins and miseries of the times, find a response in the heart of this mighty nation—not blinded by fanaticism either for or against the four millions of African slaves, who are made the occasion of a double destruction to the nation; the way is still clear and wide before us, in which if we will walk, present triumph, and future security, freedom, and independence, are still attainable. It is impossible to deny, that the change of policy suddenly announced by the President in September 1862, totally changed the character of the war, and the posture of the nation. And it behooves the free states to understand clearly that their destiny will probably be as fatally involved, under this deplorable change, whether the administration succeeds or fails in the new policy, as the destiny of the border slave states, or even that of the rebel states.

ART. II.—*A Commentary on Ecclesiastes, by Moses Stuart, late Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Edited and Revised by R. D. C. Robbins, Professor in Middlebury College. Andover: Warren H. Draper. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. New York: John Wiley. Philadelphia: Smith, English and Co., 1862.*

THE man who can expound God's Word learnedly, judiciously, and in a popular manner, infusing the spirit of the inspired writers into the commentary, stands upon high vantage-ground for usefulness. Learned professors in theological

seminaries, have, falling in with their appropriate work, rare opportunities for examining and expounding the Scriptures. Pastors of churches may produce popular, and if they have disciplined minds, learned commentaries. The Presbyterian Church should encourage every honest effort, on the part of her ministry, to write orthodox, wise, and appropriate works expounding the Bible. Her Board of Publication might thus give to the world commentaries in accordance with her Standards, that would not only bless her Sabbath schools, but instruct her elders and ministers.

The Book of Ecclesiastes has been a *crux criticorum*. Yet several commentaries on this Book have appeared of late—some in the German, some in the English language. The German commentaries are unsafe for readers that are not aware of the dangers of Rationalism and Neology.

In the English language, "The Royal Preacher," by Dr. James Hamilton, of London, was issued some years ago. It is not a critical work. It does not profess to be. Nor is it exactly a commentary. It is a cluster of brilliants, eminently fit to encircle the gifted author's head. The main truths of the Book of Ecclesiastes are presented in a style of unusual beauty and attractiveness.

A more recent work, and far better as a commentary, is that by Rev. Charles Bridges, M. A., Rector of Hinton Martell, Dorset. Nor is this work a critical one. It does not even give an analysis of the Book. But it is full of terse and instructive remarks, and it abounds in Gospel truths. For common readers it stands out as a pre-eminently useful commentary.

As unlike these as it is possible to be, is the work of Professor Stuart. It is eminently critical. It displays great learning and research. But for common readers it is absolutely worthless. It is evident that it was not intended for them. The Hebrew scholar will find much in the work to benefit him. But let him beware of the winding paths which so often cross and recross the true road, with every degree of divergence. Professor Stuart was one of New England's representative men. He was a true specimen of those who, in their desire to be original, call in question those doctrines that had been established as the belief of the church for ages.

They fear not the consequences of unsettling old foundations. They laugh to scorn the man who loves the creed of his church, and walks in the path that his father trod before him. The skepticism so prevalent in New England, may be traced in part to the novelties introduced by her religious teachers. Let others be warned by the ensample. The church may become the very bulwark of infidelity. The Roman Catholic idea, that what is a mere opinion of the church in one age may ripen into a dogma in another, would make truth not fixed and eternal, but subject to the mutations of time.

So Bishop Colenso, the Essayists, and others of high standing in the Church of England, would repudiate the Books of Moses as inspired; and blasphemously insinuate that the knowledge of our Lord was limited, because he quoted them as such. This same disposition to strike out new paths, and reject the old, has done immense mischief in our own country.

Professor Stuart was far from infidelity. But he was bold in his speculations; and his familiarity with German theology and criticism gave wings to his adventurous flights. Were Professor Stuart still living, an exposure of his views would be less delicate. Books, however, are public property; and faithfulness to one's own generation requires that their false teachings should be set in their proper light, though their authors are sleeping their last sleep. Professor Stuart's proneness to reject the plain teachings of the Scriptures for novel and untenable views, is frequently seen in his exposition of the Word of God. It is proposed to call the reader's attention to the Professor's arguments to prove that Solomon was not the writer of the Book of Ecclesiastes! God's Word says plainly, that the author of the Book was "the son of David, king in Jerusalem." Solomon was the only person that was both the son of David and king in Jerusalem. Therefore, Solomon *was* the author. We need no higher authority than God's Word to prove that Solomon was the author. Yet, Professor Stuart, following Grotius, De Wette and others, supposes that a later, but unknown writer, has palmed off upon the world a book as though it were written by Solomon. If this can be believed, then it requires but another step to reject the book altogether as an inspired document. The Professor calls the opinion, that Solomon was the author, an "old tradition," and says:

"Of late, scarcely an advocate of the old tradition has appeared." He adds:

"When we have reviewed the ground occupied by the question, we shall, perhaps, deem it strange if any future critic should engage in such an undertaking."

In such an undertaking as what? As advocating the old tradition that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes! Reader, you had believed God's Word, that Solomon uttered or wrote the Book of Ecclesiastes. Prepare to have your faith in this testimony overthrown! After the arguments of the very learned Professor, that would be a rash critic that would still adhere to the "old tradition!" His first argument is this:

"(1.) *Many things are said by Cbheleth* (the Hebrew term for preacher, by which he continually designates the author, instead of saying Solomon), *which show that Solomon is only occasionally, and not constantly speaking.* He says in i: 12, that he '*was king in Jerusalem.*' The praeterite tense here (יָהָיָה, *I was*) refers, of course, to a *past* time, and it conveys the idea that when the passage was written he was no longer king. But Solomon was king until his death, and could, therefore, never have said, '*I was king, but am not now.*' Then, again, how passing strange for him, as Solomon, to tell those whom he was addressing that he *was king in Jerusalem!* Could he suppose that they needed to be informed of this? But a writer in times long after Solomon might easily slide into the expression that Coheleth *had been king,*" pp. 86, 87.

Will this argument bear the test? The praeterite tense does not necessarily convey the idea that the writer *had been* king, but *was not now.* The editor of the work, Professor Robbins, in a note, shows that it does not. He says, "A frequent secondary use of the praeter tense of the Hebrew verb is to indicate a state of being which, beginning at some former period, still continues to exist at the time of narration." Stuart's own Roediger, as well as Nordheimer's Grammar, may be cited in confirmation.

Stuart himself, in commenting on chapter iii, verse 15, says: "The first יָהָיָה here, though in the form of the praeter tense, includes a present sense (as the praeter often does), viz.: *which was and is.*" Again, on vi: 10, he says: "The perfect

מֶלֶךְ is here used as an abstract present, including what *was and still is.*" Again, vii: 10, "מֶלֶךְ, was and still is." Here, then, is Professor Stuart's answer to his own argument, and Solomon, so far from saying he was king in Jerusalem, but is not now, said, "I was and still am king in Jerusalem." Nor was it "passing strange" that Solomon should say to those present, that he was king *in Jerusalem*, even if the auditors knew it. He was showing them what advantages he had for making investigations. He was king in a city of wealth and learning, where he had at command what he desired. So much for this argument. The Professor turns round and confutes it with his own criticisms.

The Professor proceeds:

"In i: 16, he (Cohemoth) says: 'I acquired more wisdom than all who were in Jerusalem before me.' Doubtless, being a king, he compares himself with others of the same rank, i. e., with *kings*; and how many of these were in Jerusalem before Solomon? *One only*, viz.: David. Who, then, constitute the *all*? It is only a later writer who would speak thus; and even such a one could so speak only by omitting any special reference to the incongruity seemingly apparent in the declaration as attributed to Solomon. The sentence looks like that of some writer who lived after there had been many kings at Jerusalem. Moreover, in the mouth of Solomon himself, this would wear something of the air of self-magnifying; while a later writer, who admired Solomon, would naturally speak thus of him. In like manner, in ii: 7, 9, he speaks of surpassing, in various respects, 'all who were in Jerusalem before him.' But in the respects there named, only *kings* could well be brought into comparison with him who was a great king; and therefore the same difficulty arises as before," p. 87.

How a man of Professor Stuart's acknowledged learning could so mistake the original Hebrew as to argue from the words "before me" (in English), that Solomon was not the writer because David *only* was before him, is astonishing! The original is, literally, *before my face*. The word translated "before me" in these passages is, מִלְּפָנַי, which means, *in my presence*. It does not mean "before me" in point of time. It has no reference to time. The same word is used in the first commandment—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." It would be ridiculous to explain this as meaning that we are

to have no other gods before the true God, *in point of time*. It is remarkable that while Professor Stuart makes learned criticisms on almost every Hebrew word in the Book of Ecclesiastes he makes no criticism on 'לפני (lepani). One can hardly avoid the conclusion that he purposely avoided it, lest he should overthrow his own argument, and thus spoil his theory that, not Solomon, but a later writer, was the author of the Book. Professor Stuart *knew* that the original word means *in the presence of*, and not *before*, *in point of time*.

The Professor thinks, also, that in the mouth of Solomon his reference to his having acquired more wisdom than all that were before him in Jerusalem, wore "the air of self-magnifying." It certainly does not wear so much the air of self-magnifying as does the remark of the Professor, when he says, "When *we* have reviewed the ground occupied by the question, we shall perhaps deem it strange if any future critic should engage in such an undertaking" as to maintain that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes! Here, if the Professor does not tell the world that he had more knowledge than all that were *before* him, he certainly judged himself to have more knowledge than all that would come *after* him, unless they agreed with him. Shall we, therefore, argue that the commentary attributed to Professor Stuart was not his?

But the Professor would gladly press into his service, iv: 8, "There is one man and no second; moreover he has no son nor brother; and yet there is no end to all his toil," etc. (Stuart's own translation.)

The Professor says:

"If iv: 8, could be shown to have a particular personal meaning, and that the person in view was the writer of the book himself, it would bring before us a striking incongruity. The case there supposed is one where the individual has neither *son* nor *brother*. Solomon had both," page 87.

What a pity the writer of Ecclesiastes did not say that he was himself the man referred to! Then the conclusion would be inevitable that Solomon was not the author. But the Professor admits that the text probably refers to a *supposed* case; and yet its introduction into the argument shows his wish that

it might be applied to the writer of Ecclesiastes, and thus prove that it was not Solomon.

It requires a fruitful imagination to make iv : 13, 14, refer to Solomon as "an old and foolish king," and to Jeroboam as "a wise and prosperous young man." But the Professor endeavors to make it so, to show that it was not Solomon who wrote thus concerning himself. Good arguments seem to be scarce when such are needed.

But the learned Professor has other arguments under this head. Hear him:

"In viii : 3, an adviser is introduced, who counsels the prudent course of obeying the king in everything. This would not be strange for a king to say; but when one clause declares that the prudent individual must not hesitate or delay even in respect to a *wicked* command, it would seem very singular to find Solomon thus characterizing his own commands. Then, again, when the writer gives his own view of this matter of unlimited obedience, in verses 5, 6, he says, that such indiscriminate and blind obedience will incur the guilt of sin, and bring the inevitable judgment of God upon him who yields to it; verses 7, 8. All this is hardly congruous with *kingly* opinion," p. 88.

It is a sufficient reply to say that our English translation says nothing about obeying "*wicked* commands." And if an inspired king can not object to "indiscriminate and blind obedience," because it would not be a "*kingly* opinion," then inspiration is conformed to the whims and freaks of erring men! Such criticisms are calculated to disparage God's Word. Infidelity rejoices in such views of inspiration. Good but mistaken men, in New England and elsewhere, have, by such teachings, contributed largely to the abounding skepticism. Give us our orthodox standards, and adherence to them, though pronounced servile, rather than that mental independence that makes shipwreck of the faith.

Professor Stuart next refers to v : 7, iii : 16, iv : 1, vii : 7, 10, viii : 9, x : 4-7, 16-19. In these verses various oppressions are mentioned, some of which the writer of Ecclesiastes had witnessed, and in which some rulers are described. He then, most disingenuously asks:

"Can we now, in any way, suppose all these to be the words of *Solomon*, describing himself as a haughty, violent, unjust, tyrannical,

oppressor? Was he a glutton, a drunkard, an idler—he who spake three thousand proverbs, wrote one thousand and five songs, and many treatises of botany, besides managing wisely all the affairs of his kingdom? I. Kings iv : 32, seq. Did he permit the land to be full of oppressive magistrates, who caught at bribes, condemned the righteous, and acquitted the wicked? Was not the power in his own hands to remedy all this? and to do judgment and justice? And yet Coheleth says, iv : 2, 3, that death is preferable to life under the then existing oppression. Yea, in his impatience, he even wishes that he had never been born. And all this when, if Solomon be concerned in the matter, it was at any moment in his power to put a stop to the evils complained of! How is it possible to suppose that Solomon ascribes all this great wickedness and folly to himself? Let any one read the history of his enlightened and peaceful reign, as given in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, and he will see a picture directly the opposite of all this. The matter of *Solomon's authorship*, in respect to such passages, seems quite impossible," p. 89.

It is a sufficient answer to say that Solomon had no reference to himself, his own magistrates, or the kingdom of Israel over which he ruled, in these passages. Solomon's knowledge was not limited to the land of Palestine. He tells us that he "turned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun," iv : 1. It was of *all these* that he was speaking; and it is mere sophistry to restrict them to Solomon and his magistrates. And it is a mere rhetorical flourish to ask, "How is it possible to suppose that Solomon ascribes all this great wickedness and folly to himself?" It is not possible to suppose it. And none but a prejudiced mind could believe that if Solomon were the writer, he was speaking of his own oppressions. So much for Professor Stuart's argument from the "*things said by Coheleth*." God's truth still stands unshaken—Ecclesiastes is the words of the preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem;" i. e., of *Solomon*.

Professor Stuart's next argument is thus stated :

"(2.) *The general state and condition of things, when this book was written, indicates a period very different from that of Solomon's reign,*" page 89.

He then reiterates what he had before stated about the civil

condition of Israel under Solomon, as not corresponding with the oppressions spoken of by the writer, etc.

The Professor then speaks of Ecclesiastes v: 1 (4: 17, of his Hebrew Bible), "Keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to offer the sacrifice of fools." He thinks that there is here something incongruous with the "condition and circumstances of him who had built the temple, and made magnificent preparations for offerings." Indeed! who else could see the incongruity? Nor did Professor Stuart see it at all times. He had said on page 18, "The manner in which he (Cohemoth) speaks of frequenting religious worship (iv: 17, v: 1, seq.), shows that he speaks of it in a way which would be familiar to those who frequented the temple-service." But the Professor seems to have a more practiced eye when he wrote page 90! So inconsistent is he with himself, that one is led to believe that it was merely to sustain a theory that he ventured to make this passage an argument.

The only other passage which the Professor adduces under this head, is vii: 26-28, "respecting the extreme *baseness of women*," as he calls it. He says, it "seems hardly consonant with the views of him who had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines." But a candid reader sees nothing in the passage but what might be expected from one who was in Solomon's position.

Professor Stuart's third and last argument is stated in these words:

"(3.) *Another source of doubt as to the authorship of Solomon, springs from the style and diction of the Book.*"

He adds:

"Whosoever comes from an attentive, critical reading of the Book of Proverbs, written or compiled by Solomon, for the most part, to that of Cohemoth, will find himself in a region entirely new. William of Malmesbury is scarcely more diverse from Macaulay, or Chaucer from Pope, than Cohemoth is from Proverbs. It is impossible to feel that one is in the hands of the same writer," p. 91.

He endeavors to make this out, in the first place, by showing that "the subjects are diverse." And is this a "new thing

under the sun," that the same author should treat on different subjects? If a man should argue that Dr. Isaac Watts was not the author of the Psalms and Hymns commonly attributed to him, because they treat on a different subject from that of his book on Logic, he would give no great evidence of wisdom. And it might be said that the style of his hymns are as different from the style of his work on Logic, as the style of "William of Malmesbury" is from that of "Macaulay;" and that "it is impossible to feel that one is in the hands of the same writer." Stuart, however, reluctantly admits that "the same writer might change his theme!" Wonderful admission! Solomon, who wrote on Botany, and composed Songs, and made Proverbs, *might* possibly change his theme! Having made this remarkable admission, the Professor adds: "But when we come to the *coloring of the style and diction*, it is impossible to make out anything but the widest diversity" (p. 91). The Professor argues, that there is in the Book of Ecclesiastes "the *later Hebrew and Chaldaism*," while in the Proverbs is found "the *golden Hebrew of the golden age*." Now, as Solomon spoke the contents of this book, in all probability, to the foreign wise men and princes, who gathered to hear his wisdom, is it strange that he should adapt his style somewhat to his auditors? This may account for the Chaldaisms, and other words which are *said* to belong to the later Hebrew. Nothing would be more natural. In I. Kings, iv: 34, it is said: "And there came all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom." From Chaldea, and Persia, and Phenicia, as well as from Sheba, the rulers may have come; and this very Book of Ecclesiastes may have constituted a part of his instructions to his royal, and otherwise eminent visitors. Why not? And if so, is it strange that his style should be adapted to his auditors? And the words which he used, supposed to belong only to the later Hebrew, may have been words in use in other nations, which were afterward transferred from their languages into the Hebrew.

Professor Stuart argues that "brevity, precision, compactness and energy of expression, predominate" in the Proverbs; while in the Ecclesiastes the style is "here and there expansive and diluted." Let Professor Stuart, or any other man,

prepare a work consisting of Proverbs, and also preach a popular sermon—will not the former be more brief, concise, and compact than the latter? And will not the latter have “repetitious phrases,” that the truths presented may be fastened upon the memories and hearts of the auditors?

Indeed, the Professor himself, in another part of his work (p. 74), accounts for the use of words in Ecclesiastes that are not met with elsewhere. He says:

“New phraseology and new meanings of words, arise from the novel subjects of which the writer is treating, i. e., his *philosophizing* on the vanity of the world. He was at liberty, like all other writers, to choose language adapted to his own purpose. We see in it little indeed of *technicality*; but still we perceive that we are by no means reading the common Hebrew of the other books. But it would be far from candor and fairness, to accuse Coheleth of unacquaintance with good Hebrew usage, because he feels constrained to employ terms and phrases not elsewhere to be found. *Cuique Summ.* It is his right to choose language adapted to the nature of his discussion,” p. 74.

It is refreshing to hear the Professor overthrowing his own argument, against the authorship of Solomon, because Solomon would not use “the later Hebrew,” in which he says the book abounds.

On page 84, he says:

“It is evident from the nature of the book—a book of practical ethical philosophy—that there must be, in some respects, a *diction* peculiar to itself; I mean, that language adapted to *philosophy* must be employed. Hence many words in the book, which are not elsewhere found in the Hebrew. To this account, I can hardly doubt, not a few of the words may be put, which are classed by Knobel and others among the later or the latest Hebrew.”

The Professor's arguments, however, are most effectually overthrown by himself, on pp. 77–82. He says that Knobel has made extravagant and ungrounded allegations concerning the number of words and phrases belonging to the later Hebrew. He shows that Knobel attaches to “the later Hebrew element” words which can not properly be put there; that words, which Knobel says have “a new sense” attached to them in Ecclesiastes, are found with the same sense in

Proverbs, Joshua, I. Samuel, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Job, and the Psalms.

Professor Stuart says, p. 79 :

"If one will now call to mind how often abstracts are required in a treatise of *philosophy* like the present, he will think it nothing strange, and no special proof of later Hebrew, that such nouns are frequent in *Cohleleth*."

Stuart then adduces eight such abstracts as the only ones that are not found elsewhere, and adds :

"The easy and obvious formation of these for the writer's purpose, renders it difficult for us to establish anything from them in regard to *the age* of such forms. The use of them depended, obviously and merely, on the need of them; for the form is altogether *normal* and *analogous*."

He says again, on page 81 :

"We have, then, after having examined Knobel's list of the later Hebrew words, only a few remaining. Taking the amount of what is left, we find only some ten or eleven cases, which may fairly be brought within the confines of later Hebrew. And some doubt must even hang over these."

Thus ends in smoke the great argument, that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes, because of the later Hebrew words and phrases in the book! It matters not if Stuart's views do coincide with those of Grotius, Eichhorn, Schmidt, De Wette, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Hitzig, and others. The truth is not dependent upon great names. "Thus saith the Lord," is of more authority than all the critics in Germany and America. The arguments of Professor Stuart have been presented fairly, and in their full force. Let the reader judge whether they will stand the test of truth.

The learned Professor treats of the following subjects in his introduction:

1. The General Nature of the Book.
2. Special Design and Method of the Book.
3. Unity of the Book.
4. Diction of the Book.
5. Who was the Author?
6. Credit and General History of the Book.

7. Ancient Versions of Coheleth.

8. Modern Versions.

9. Commentators.

The Design and Method of the Book is the only point that will be further discussed in this article.

Much learning is displayed by the author, and he presents us rather a new theory. Some minds may be satisfied with his theory. The great mass of readers will feel that the subject is involved in as much perplexity as before. It is not easy to condense his views, spread as they are over fifty pages, into the small space that must here be occupied.

On the general nature of the Book of Ecclesiastes the Professor makes some valuable remarks. He says it is "a work of *practical philosophy*. All the reasonings are built upon the results of experience." He says: "As a specimen of ancient philosophy, the oldest and the only one among the ancient Hebrews which has come down to us, Ecclesiastes would seem to deserve the notice and attention of modern philosophers, and specially of those who undertake to write the *history* of ancient philosophy. Have the Hebrews—the only nation on earth before the Christian era who had enlightened views of God and duty—have they no claim to be heard on the subject of *practical moral philosophy*?"

It would indeed seem as though philosophers of modern times had almost, or altogether ignored, this oldest of all treatises on moral philosophy. Let it demand its place.

Stuart maintains that the first great object of the writer of Ecclesiastes is, "to show the vanity of human efforts and all earthly things in which men seek satisfaction." This idea, he says, is a golden thread running through the whole book. He maintains that i: 2, announces the theme of the author, viz.: "Vanity of vanities," etc.; and that the first four chapters are employed principally to elaborate and illustrate this idea. He teaches that the second part of the book mingles precepts and practical instruction with the representation of facts and occurrences; that with the beginning of the fifth chapter the writer begins to speak *imperatively*, or in the way of exhortation. A variety of subjects is embraced in this second part, comprising also four chapters, to the close of the eighth. Professor Stuart thinks that in this part "divers

objections are presented," as coming from those who find fault with the sentiments of the writer, or from the writer's own mind, "some of which are answered forthwith, and some after intervening matter has been thrown in, which pressed upon his mind." It is in this way that the Professor accounts for the apparently infidel and Epicurean teachings of the Book.

In the third part of the Book, including the ninth and twelfth chapters with those that intervene, the Professor thinks the whole discourse takes a different turn. "The doubts and queries are dismissed." The subject becomes more cheerful, and cheerful enjoyment is commended. A description of old age forms an apposite conclusion, with the return of the spirit to God.

The Professor accounts for the strange sentiments that seem to be taught in various parts of the Book, by supposing them to be the language of an objector, or the language of his own heart in its perplexity suggesting difficulties. This, he thinks, is the only way to account for teachings which seem to be contrary to other teachings found on the sacred pages of inspiration. But Stuart does not suggest any rule by which the reader of Ecclesiastes can ascertain what are the words of the objector and what are the replies of the author. Every one is left to draw his own conclusions. Hence, while one reader may make the sentence, "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked;" (ix: 2,) the language of an objector; another may make this the sentiment of the inspired penman. Whatever the reader wishes to be true he receives as divine teaching; whatever he wishes untrue, he ascribes to the objector. And whatever a commentator thinks accordant with his system, he adopts as inspired revelation; and whatever he thinks would interfere with his teachings, he sets down to the account of an objector. This would fill the Book with the greatest uncertainty. And, indeed, there is nothing in Ecclesiastes which would suggest objections and answers. There is nothing similar to the writings of Paul, who introduces the words of an objector by the expression, "Thou wilt say then unto me," and follows them by the remark, "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix: 19, 20). If there were any intimation that an objector is introduced we might thus account for

several passages. There is *no need* of such a supposition. There is no need for placing any part of the Book in the category of an objection, or of supposing it untrue. With a proper view of the teachings of the Book, every part becomes consistent with every other part. There is no conflict, no infidelity, no Epicureanism. All is truth, wholesome, eternal truth.

The following views are suggested to the intelligent reader as the design and teachings of Ecclesiastes:

This Book of Ecclesiastes is a discourse or sermon of Solomon. It is about the length of an ordinary modern sermon. Though a sermon, it is not quite as methodical as some modern sermons, but far more so than many others. Like modern sermons, it commences with a text or theme for discussion. When or where uttered, we are not informed. There are reasons for supposing that it was delivered in the presence of the foreign wise men and princes, who, like the queen of Sheba, came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear his wisdom. "There came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom" (I Kings, iv: 34). Standing up in the presence of his curious and learned auditors, as Paul did in Athens at a later day, he spoke of God, of his counsels, and of a future judgment. And, indeed, on a careful inspection, this sermon and Paul's address to the Athenians have strong points of resemblance. Both are to us now revealed theology; but they are discourses on natural theology. Paul pointed to the altar erected "to the unknown God." Hence he directs his hearers to God who made the world and giveth life; to God's purposes; and finally to the judgment. So Solomon pointed to nature; to the rising and setting sun, the shifting breeze, the running rivers (i: 5-7). Then he directs the hearers to God's purposes (iii: 14), and to the judgment. "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked" (iii: 17). "For all these things God shall bring thee into judgment" (xi: 9). To argue a future and a judgment seems to be the object of Solomon's sermon. But as his audience were not all familiar with the previously-written Hebrew Scriptures he would not argue from those Scriptures. He would prove another state of existence in a new and original way. He would present his own

original investigations on the subject, as he was inspired to do. And he sets out with the inquiry, *Of what advantage is this life without another?* For this seems to be the true import of the third verse of the first chapter, which is really Solomon's starting point, as will be shown. That verse, which is Solomon's text, reads thus: "What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun?" Labor taken "*under the sun*," is labor for *this* life without regard to a future. And Solomon uses the phrase "*under the sun*" no less than twenty-eight times in this short treatise, or sermon, by which it is evident that his mind attached an important meaning to it. He contrasts labor taken for this life, and the rewards of this life, with labor taken for the future world and its glorious rewards. Keeping in view that the Book of Ecclesiastes is a treatise on the question, *what profit is there in this life if there is no other?* and that this question is preparatory to the great doctrine of a future life and a future judgment, which Solomon eventually declares, we find the difficulties of the Book cleared up. We find a freshness and beauty about it that is truly enchanting. The enigmas and riddles of the Book are all solved; and the treatise stands out prominent—an argument for a God, for immortality, for a future reward. If the great object of the sermon is kept in view all the parts harmonize, and constitute a beautiful and connected whole, and vindicate the government of God from the assaults so often made upon it. What seem to be skeptical teachings present themselves as forcible arguments for a future state. What profit is there in this life if there is no other? If there is no other, "that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath: so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

If there is no other life, "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." If there is no other life, "Be not righteous overmuch; neither make thyself overwise: why shouldst thou destroy thyself?" Why be a martyr for principle, and receive no reward?

If there is no other life, generation succeeds generation, and

passes away like the rising and setting sun, the shifting breeze, the running rivers. Like these, human life is but a coming and going, or labor without satisfaction, accomplishing nothing worthy of the great Author of life. There is no profit—no new thing to satisfy the soul. From all this a future is inferred. But till the third chapter a future is not distinctly *announced*. In the third and subsequent chapters the judgment is distinctly declared.

But, it may be asked, why consider the third verse and not the second of the first chapter, the text or theme? In reply the following views are presented :

The first and second verses of the first chapter, and the twelfth chapter from the eighth verse to the conclusion, seem to have been inserted by a different person from the writer of the treatise. He was equally inspired, it is true; but there are strong evidences that another person (call him, if you please, the editor of Solomon's work) wrote the first and second verses as an *introduction*, and the last seven verses of the last chapter as a suitable *conclusion* of the Book of Ecclesiastes. It is not uncommon for the sacred books to be supplemented by some one besides the writers of them. Of the books written by Moses, Numbers and Deuteronomy seem to have been thus supplemented. In Numbers xii : 3, we read : "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth." This verse was evidently not written by Moses; for he would not thus speak of himself. It is put in parenthetically, perhaps by the prophet Samuel. The last chapter of Deuteronomy was added by some other person; for Moses did not write an account of his own death. Joshua probably wrote the Book called by his name. But, if so, he could not have written the last five verses, for they give an account of his death. They were, therefore, inserted by some other inspired person. Some other passages in Joshua seem also to have been inserted by another. (See iv : 9, and xv : 63.)

The first Book of Samuel to the end of the 24th chapter, seems to have been written by the prophet Samuel himself. But the remaining seven chapters, and the second Book, could not have been written by him; for they record events which took place after his death. Indeed, the two Books of Samuel

seem to have been written by the three prophets, Samuel, Nathan, and Gad. (See I. Chron. xxix: 29.)

The Book of Nehemiah was written by Nehemiah; as is evident from his using the first person singular in relating things connected with himself. But in that Book is a passage containing twenty-six verses, which seems to have been inserted by another. Horne says: "The insertion of the greater part of the register in xii: 1-26, may be accounted for by supposing it either to have been added by some subsequent author, or perhaps by the authority of the great synagogue; for it seems to be unconnected with the narrative of Nehemiah, and if genuine, must ascribe to him a degree of longevity which appears scarcely credible."

The Psalms were written by ten different authors; and yet they are called "the Psalms of David," because David was the principal author. The Book of Proverbs is ascribed to Solomon; and the Book starts out with the announcement, "The Proverbs of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel." And yet the thirtieth chapter is by Agur, the son of Jakeh; and the thirty-first is by King Lemuel. Also the first six verses of the first chapter seem to be by another. The first verse of the Song of Solomon seems also by another, simply stating who the author was.

So the Book of Ecclesiastes is a sermon of Solomon, with a preface and an appendix by another. The following may be assigned as reasons for the opinion:

(1.) Like Nehemiah Solomon uses the first person singular when speaking of himself in this Book. But the verses supposed to be added, speak of him in the third person, calling him "the Preacher."

(2.) The Preacher is complimented as wise, and as teaching the people knowledge, which Solomon would hardly have said of himself in this form.

(3.) It would be perfectly natural for a person, in putting a preface and an appendix to another's sermon, to commence the appendix with the same words with which he left the preface, to show to the reader where his own remarks had been left off and then resumed again. He prefaces with the sentence, "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; vanity of vanities; all is vanity." And, then, after laying the sermon

before the reader, he repeats, as calling the reader's attention to what he had said, "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity."

(4). As another reason for supposing that there is a preface and an appendix by another; there is completeness in the sermon, if we leave out the verses in question; and the conclusion of the sermon is most sublime: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

Thus the first verse is like the title page of a pamphlet, announcing the author. The second verse is a general statement, calling the attention to the contents of the pamphlet. But it does not precisely point out the whole of the great theme discussed. The editor allows Solomon to do this in his own words; which he does in the third verse.

It seemed necessary to make the above somewhat protracted remarks, to show that the third verse, and not the second, is the theme of Solomon, and, therefore, the key to the whole treatise. This having been overlooked by commentators, they have necessarily failed to bring out, in its force and beauty, the connection of the parts of the treatise, and the pertinence of many passages. It is strange that some should argue, as they do, that the key (or text) is found in the middle of the discourse. And yet it has been maintained, that verse fifteen of the seventh chapter is the key. But it is perfectly natural to suppose that an inquiry, placed at the very beginning of Solomon's sermon, should be regarded as containing the essence of the whole, as the text—the key to unlock the hidden treasures of the whole Book. It is all-important, therefore, that we arrive at a correct decision, as to the meaning of Solomon's theme, the third verse of chapter first.

We speak of mere worldly things, and call them *sublunary*; *i. e.*, under the moon. Solomon, on the other hand, calls them *tahath-hashamesh*; *i. e.*, under the sun. It is evident that Solomon meant to restrict his question to the things of *this* world in contradistinction to the things of *another* or *future* life. We must consider him, then, as contrasting the labors for this life with labors for another life. The former he pronounces, by the strong negative implied in the question, *profitless*. This life is incomplete without another. There must, therefore,

be another. He then proceeds immediately to illustrate his theme.

Verse 4. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth forever." The original is forcible. "Generation passeth, and generation cometh." If there is no future, the coming and going of men, generation after generation, is of little consequence. It is just a stage—a mere drama. It is a farce. There is nothing real. There is no result worthy of the great Author of all things. *Man*, so far from being important, is less important than the *earth* on which he lives so short a time. *He* comes and goes, "but the earth abideth." If man's labor terminates on earthly things, and he perishes when he dies, then the true order is reversed; man is not immortal, while the earth is immortal (i. e., so far as reason teaches). The earth is the abiding stage, while human life is a coming on and going off—a mere passing scene, soon to terminate without any important result. "What profit?"

In the next verses, we have a comparison between several natural phenomena in their apparent barrenness of results, and human beings merely coming and going. The Hebrew *vav*, here translated "also," is often used to make a comparison. We may ask, what good is accomplished by generation after generation coming on the stage of life and passing off again, and being no more; just as we may ask, what good is apparently accomplished by the sun rising and setting in a constant round; and the wind whirling about continually; and the rivers running apparently with the view of filling the sea, but never accomplishing it, and returning again. Nothing seems to be accomplished. The sun of this morning is where it was a century ago—it has made no progress. The wind of this day is as it was last year—what has it brought to pass? The Nile of this year overflowing its banks, is but a repetition of every year's process—it seems to have done nothing. There is a monotonous repetition of the same thing. So is man, as though he were reproduced from generation to generation, to run the same round of pain and folly, and life and death, and joy and grief. *What profit hath life without another life?*

But Solomon is preparing the way, even in this comparison, to show that there is to be a grand and glorious result, in the

far-off future. And he brings it out, especially in the eleventh chapter, by similar figures. The Nile is not a mere waste of waters; but the bread is cast upon it which shall be found after many days (xi: 1). The changing wind brings up the clouds, to scatter their fatness on the furrowed fields (xi: 3). And the sun is not a mere circling orb, to accomplish nothing; but it brings light and joy (xi: 7). And so, the generations of men are not a mere coming and going, with no result. But the soul lives forever. "The dust," it is true, "returns to the dust as it was;" but "the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (xii: 7).

A careful examination of the whole Book will show that this idea is kept in view, viz.: that this life, with all its labors, is absolutely without value, if there is no future.

The last part of the first chapter is devoted to Solomon's qualifications for investigating the subject. He was a king over an enlightened people (v. 12). He applied himself heartily and earnestly to the search (13). He had been an observer (14). And he had discovered that the evils of this world and its deficiencies, could not be corrected and supplied by human means (15). He had evidence from communion with his own heart, that he had given himself wholly to the investigation; and the investigation itself had yielded only grief and sorrow (16-18).

The second chapter is principally employed in giving Solomon's experience of the worthlessness of this world in itself considered. He had tested it in all its forms of supposed excellence, and found nothing in it. He, therefore, returns to the question, "What hath man of all his labor, and of the vexation of his heart, wherein he hath labored *under the sun*?" for *this* world? He says emphatically that he had found that "there was *no* profit under the sun" (v. 11).

In the third chapter, after showing that in this life ("under the heaven," v. 1), events are all appointed by Providence; and after resuming the inquiry, "what profit hath he that worketh in that wherein he laboreth?" (v. 9), he begins to bring out the great doctrine of a future judgment. Thus he advances, step by step, to announce a future state, which previously he had been inferring from the worthlessness of this life in itself considered; and he declares, also, the

certainly of a judgment. The eleventh verse has great depth and force, and prepares the way for a full avowal of Solomon's belief in a future judgment. It is itself a declaration of a future eternal state, and the bearing of the present upon the future. Dr. James Hamilton gives the following liberal, but just translation: "He hath made everything beautiful in his time, and in the heart of everything he hath set an eternity: so that no man can find out from the beginning to the end any work that God maketh—any process that God conducteth." The word "world" in our translation, is by many able critics translated, "remote time, eternity." God has made everything beautiful in *his* time. The whole, from beginning to end, is his time—eternity is his time. And he hath set an eternity in the heart of everything. He hath given, as it were, even to inanimate things a purpose to fulfill a future destiny. And till that destiny is fulfilled, no man can find out what God designs to accomplish by it. No one can see from the beginning to the end, or the whole plan.

But the sixteenth and seventeenth verses bring out the great doctrine, which Solomon had been inferring and hinting at, in all its force and clearness. He saw "under the sun," in this world, "the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there." He saw earthly judges partial and unrighteous—wronging the innocent, and clearing the guilty. And God seems to be like them, if we look no further than *this world*. But this leads Solomon to the great utterance of his heart in the seventeenth verse: "I said in *mine heart*, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked."

The great idea is here *fully* brought out, for which he had been preparing the minds of his hearers, viz.: Since there is incompleteness, and crookedness, and sorrow, and apparent injustice under the sun; and man labors in vain if his prospects terminate with this life; there *must* be a future judgment of the righteous and the wicked; there is a future judgment. This future judgment will have its place as well as things *under the sun*—as well as corrupt earthly courts—as well as our birth, death, etc. As there is a time *here*, "under the heaven," v. 1, so there is a time *there*, at the judgment.

Bishop Patrick says, "the last words of this verse may, in

my judgment, be thus most literally translated out of the Hebrew: 'There is time for (judging) every purpose, and every work there.' But the Bishop supposes the word "*there*" to refer to the corrupt court; whereas it seems to refer to the final judgment. There is a time for (judging) every purpose and every work *there*, at the final judgment. This seems to be the most consistent application of the word.

To condense the teachings of the whole chapter, Solomon begins with the occurrences known to all; and shows how they are in the hand of God. His sovereignty is seen in our birth and death; in killing and healing; breaking down, and building up; sorrow and joy; meeting and parting; getting and losing, etc. He then goes on to show the hand of God guiding "ponderous orbs and mighty incidents" to a far-off goal—to eternity. He brings us to the termination of all earthly events in a righteous award, God justifying himself before the universe. He then returns to the point to be illustrated, viz.: if there is no future, all is valueless—man and beast share the same fate—life is a farce, unworthy of its Author; man, with his noble powers and lofty aspirations, will at the close of this brief life be no better than a brute! And, yet, this is the infidel's proud desire—his boasted wisdom leads no further.

The fourth chapter is an example of unity in variety; containing several distinct subjects, all brought forward to illustrate the great theme, that there is no profit in life without a future state. Oppression, envy, idleness, anxious labor, the life of a miser, of a ruler, and of a subject; all terminate in vanity and sorrow.

The fifth chapter teaches the failure of *formal* religion, of power and of riches, to secure such advantage as the heart desires.

In the sixth chapter there is a continuation of similar themes, and the author sums up, by showing (vs. 10-12) that all those things that might be supposed to yield advantage in this life have already been named—that it is characteristic of man to seek good from them, but that in so doing he contends with God, and is no better off.

Passing over the intervening chapters, in which are many striking illustrations of the main theme, and some repetitions,

the reader's attention is called to the teachings of the last two chapters.

The eleventh is one of the most remarkable chapters in the Bible. It is the focus of the blended rays of the whole Book of Ecclesiastes. It is a clear presentation of a future judgment and reward, in beautiful figures of illustration. In the plainest language, and with most solemn emphasis, it is finally declared, that for all things God will bring us to judgment. To be more particular, the chapter teaches as follows, vs. 1-6: Do present duty, on all occasions, and all your lives, disregarding threatening obstacles, trusting to God to reward you. This is illustrated by casting bread upon the waters—giving portions to many—the clouds and falling timber, sowing and reaping grain, the unborn infant, vs. 7-10. Use God's gifts with reference to rendering an account; and provide against future misery. The whole chapter may be summed up in this brief sentence: *Do and enjoy with reference to a future award!*

In the twelfth chapter, first seven verses, we have the close of the sermon. In one of the most beautiful allegories ever penned, comparing old age to a decaying and unprotected house, we are prepared for the sublime and literal conclusion: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

The remaining verses, by another writer, show his estimate of Solomon and his work; and also show his sentiments concerning what the Book teaches. He sums up all, as the conclusion of the whole matter: "Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty (profit) of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Nowhere, not even in the New Testament, is the judgment more clearly presented. But the circumstances attending the general judgment are reserved for the sublime unfoldings of the New Testament.

ART. III.—*Politics and the Church.*

WE propose in this article to continue the subject commenced in the last No. of the Review (Dec. 1862), under the above title. We then stated that our object was to show what is the true province of the pulpit and what are the true functions of the church, in their relation to the moral, social, and civil interests of society; the special aim being to meet the popular cry raised in certain quarters against the ministry and the church, of "mixing politics and religion," whenever the people from the pulpit or through church courts are exhorted to sustain the United States Government in its efforts to put down the treason and rebellion seeking its overthrow.

It was then distinctly admitted, and we now repeat, that to bring politics, in any just acceptation of the term, either into the pulpit or church courts, for discussion or action, is a clear perversion of the authority which Christ has given to the church. But, on the other hand, we as distinctly assert, that, for the ministry and church courts to enjoin the people under their care to obey "the powers that be," both civil and spiritual, placed over them by divine authority, is but to perform a solemn religious duty imposed by God; and that, consequently, for them to instruct the people upon and warn them against treason, rebellion, and schism, as sins against God and their fellow-men, and to exercise discipline when they are committed, is but a part of the same general duty clearly set forth in the Scriptures; and further, for the ministry and church courts to neglect proper instruction upon either branch of this subject, or to neglect discipline for any of these offenses, and more especially at such a time as the present in our country, when this duty of obedience to rulers is so sadly neglected and these sins are so flagrantly committed by large numbers in every branch of the church, is practically to ignore some of the plainest injunctions of the word of God, and to prove recreant as teachers and governors to the demands of the commission which they hold from the Head of the church. This is the substance of the doctrine sought to be established in the previous article, and it will form the basis of the present. The aim in the manner of presentation is to bring out

only fundamental principles, and to show that the proper treatment of such topics does not invade or involve anything political, but is as essentially religious as expounding the doctrines of grace and urging faith and repentance; it being left to inference, chiefly, to apply the truth thus developed to the great issues now convulsing the nation with civil war.

The main proposition on which the whole discussion proceeds, we here repeat:—That it is within the true province of the pulpit and of church courts, to examine and determine all questions, upon all subjects, in their religious bearings, which affect the moral, social, and civil well-being of society; the Bible being their guide as to topics and the views to be taken of them, and the providence of God in the exercise of a wise discretion determining the occasions on which they shall be presented.

This proposition we proposed to sustain and illustrate, first, from the Scriptures; secondly, from the creeds and confessions of the church of all branches, in its purest portions, in all ages in so far as they speak of the subject at all; thirdly, from frequent deliverances of the church, in past times, upon a variety of special subjects, called forth by particular exigencies; fourthly, from the published writings of men of various branches and periods of the church, who are acknowledged as among its great lights; and fifthly, we challenged that the negative of this proposition could not be sustained by any clear teachings of Scripture, in terms, principle, or by any fair deduction, nor by any evangelical creeds or explicit church action of former times, nor by any prominent names in the ministry.

The former article was confined to the scriptural argument; the present will be devoted to the several remaining points. The argument proper, by which alone such a proposition can be sustained, must rest on the word of God. It is the argument from *revelation*, as the final appeal; for, "let God be true, but every man a liar." That was concluded in the previous paper. The present will exhibit the argument from *authority*. We claim for it nothing beyond what the expositions of divine truth by wise and godly men, convened in the councils of the church, or preaching the Gospel, or publishing their matured views, may justly demand from the church at

large. Such expositions probably furnish the best illustration of the meaning of God's word on many of the subjects of which they treat, that we have reason to look for at the hands of men. While, therefore, the direct testimony of God in the Scriptures is the sole rule of faith, and that to which alone every one should bow, and while every man must judge for himself of the meaning of the divine word under the illumination of the Spirit, it is of no small importance to know how the church in past times, and under favorable circumstances for ascertaining the truth, may have viewed any given subject. Upon the question now under consideration, if it shall be found that the church has borne uniform and explicit testimony to the doctrine we have attempted to establish, or if it have given only a general confirmation, it will go far to show that our deductions from the Scriptures are correct. The argument from authority, is not, therefore, to be despised. Neither is it to be abused. With a certain class of minds it is always of preponderating influence. With the adherents of the great apostacy it is everything. They are taught to believe as the church believes, and because she so teaches. But we "have not so learned Christ." We may behold the light which the true church casts along the pathway of her wonderful history without being blinded and led astray by it. Let us search for that light and walk therein.

The first point in the plan we have announced (second in order of the whole), relates to the *Creeds and Confessions* of the church. This is a most valuable species of testimony, and that to which the least exception should be taken by those with whom we are at issue; for it shows the position of various branches of the church at times when her scriptural landmarks were established by learned and pious men, after the utmost pains-taking and prayer to arrive at the true sense of revelation.*

The Westminster Confession, which is substantially the exponent of the faith of so large a portion of the reformed and evangelical churches in this country, and to a considera-

*It is said in the authentic *History of the Westminster Assembly*: "The whole time which they were in session was five years, six months, and twenty-two days; during which time they held one thousand one hundred and sixty-three sessions."

ble extent in Europe, may serve as a sample for the creeds of the reformed churches generally, with this remark—that, as the church in this country is entirely separate from the state, very little is said in this Confession, in the modified form in which it has been adopted by the Presbyterian Churches and others in the United States, upon the points at issue, compared with what may be found in some of those of the churches in Europe. But for the most part they all agree in the ground they take as to the province of the church in things by some, in these latter days, deemed secular and political. We quote from the Confession of the Presbyterian Church in the United States:

“CHAP. 23.—OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be, under him, over the people, for his own glory and the public good, and to this end hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defense and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil doers. II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate, when called thereunto; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth, so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions. III. Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or in the least interfere in matters of faith. Yet as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance. IV. It is the duty of the people to pray for magistrates,

to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake. Infidelity or indifference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him : from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted."

"CHAP. 20.—OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.— * * * II. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word. * * * IV. And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve, one another; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or to the power of godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices, as, either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church."—(*See, also, chaps. 21, 24, 25, and 31, of the Confession.*)

It thus appears that this Confession defines some of the most important powers, and assigns limits to the jurisdiction, of civil rulers; declares what they may do, and what they may not do; what belongs to their authority, what is their duty, and what would be a violation of each. It also announces wherein, -and under what conditions, their behests must be obeyed by the people. - All this we should expect in any Confession which pretended to set forth the teachings of Scripture; and all this we find. But besides these general principles, the framers of this Confession descend to specifications on several subjects, with considerable minuteness, in regard to which they say, it is proper, or the contrary, for civil rulers to legislate; and in the light of what history shows that the civil powers have often done, and what they are still doing, day by day, the Confession announces what are proper and what improper principles of such legislation; as, for example, when speaking of the laws which should regulate marriage and divorce; when declaring that the law of the

Sabbath is "a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages," and naming "the first day of the week" as the time obligatory upon "all men" for its observance, and in specifying what is essential to its proper sanctification and what is a violation of the ordinance; when declaring that civil rulers may not assume "the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or in the least interfere in matters of faith," which some of them have ever been doing from the beginning till now; when pronouncing explicitly against religious establishments, or the union of church and state; when asserting that the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions are entirely distinct, while certain civil rulers in one direction, and certain ecclesiastics in the opposite, have assumed to combine both jurisdictions in one; and, finally, with much more to the same effect, when telling the civil authorities, with unmistakable plainness, what is their positive, executive duty, toward all classes of their people, touching their strictly civil and social rights and immunities, affecting reputation, person, and property, to wit: "It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner, as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury, to any other person whatsoever."*

These may serve as a specimen of the subjects on which this Confession speaks authoritatively, in the name of Christ, and upon all of which the civil power has frequently legislated. Now, verily, on what ground is all this so elaborately set forth in one of the most noted Confessions extant, unless the church may rightfully examine into, determine, and declare, in the fear of God and from his word, the duties of all men, in all conditions and stations of life, governments, rulers, and ruled?—unless, indeed, touching all the moral aspects of these subjects, the church is placed by her Divine

* In Robert Shaw's "Exposition of the Confession of Faith," the American editor, in his notes on this section, sustains the view we have taken, that it is to man's strictly secular rights that the Confession here refers when pointing out to the state its duty. "The legitimate design of the latter (civil governments), is to secure to men their social rights, and to defend them in the enjoyment of life and property."

Head above all other powers on earth, in the sense that her authority, as derived from Christ the Ruler of all worlds and all people, warrants her, and her fidelity to Him under the demands of her commission, obliged her to speak thus explicitly in the hearing of all mankind, for their guidance and warning? This, in truth, is her express command and mission from God. The fathers of the Westminster Assembly, one of the most learned and pious bodies ever convened, never supposed they were, in these enactments, trenching on ground secular and political. And yet, according to the principles laid down by some in our day, the church, either in her courts or her pulpits, has not a particle of authority to say a word on such subjects; for what, indeed, is it, "after the way which they call heresy," but the most arrogant presumption—running the spiritual plowshare deep into the soil of secularism—for the church thus to lay down, in great principles of ecclesiastical law, to endure for all time and for the instruction of all people, rules for the "civil magistrate," and to tell the state, in terms, to its face, what it may and what it may not do by its legislative and executive authority, even to bound and limit that authority, and to hold up the vengeance of the God of Nations as the penalty for disobedience?

When we claim for the church what is here contended for, and cite this Confession to sustain the claim, we are triumphantly pointed to another chapter of the Confession, already referred to, which says: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," etc. To this we say, Amen. Matters of purely political economy or policy, as banks, tariffs, railways, the extent of suffrage, partisan politics—questions which involve no essential moral principle, and which all agree are strictly secular—may not be introduced into the pulpit or church courts, for the reason that the Scriptures reveal nothing on these subjects for the church or the world. It is plainly to subjects of this nature that these prohibitory clauses refer. But the matters immediately under consideration, as we have shown (Review, December, 1862), are the very matters which these clauses except; they are strictly and eminently "ecclesiastical," and the word of God speaks with great clearness and

fullness upon them. The framers of the Confession so regarded them, and shaped these standards accordingly, by laying down the law of God on these very topics. The fathers who adopted this Confession as modified for the church in the United States are to be understood in the same way; while they unquestionably meant by these prohibitory clauses, subjects of the nature stated—political and secular, strictly so-called—and nothing more. To put the forced construction upon them contended for by some, would be to make these fathers stultify themselves by destroying completely the explicit teaching of all the other chapters of this same Confession, where the subjects in controversy are dwelt upon as coming within the authority of the church, and on which she is enjoined to make known the divine will.

But if it still be insisted that these clauses cover the subjects in issue, and were intended to shut them out entirely, then we reply that this very section gives full authority to the church to do all we contend for, in the words immediately following the passage quoted: "unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary." Even, therefore, admitting that the prohibition covers the topics in dispute, it is only a qualified prohibition; for this language states that they may be considered, and specifies the form, manner, and circumstances, under which it may be done. This is undeniable. Our position, therefore, so far from being in the least endangered, is even strengthened, by the only passage in the entire Confession which is brought forward to destroy it, taking the construction claimed by our opponents to be correct. Here they at least ought to be willing to rest. But this is an unwarranted construction. That neither of the prohibitory clauses, nor even this permissive one, refers to the matters in controversy, but all relate to subjects which by universal concession are secular, will be plainly seen when they are read together, giving the entire section, with the punctuation found in the authorized copies of the Confession printed by the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, viz.: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for

satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate." Now, what does this language mean? The last clause refers simply to what is due to the civil magistrate. If he ask "advice for satisfaction of conscience," it would be quite unbecoming in "synods and councils" not to give it, if they were able.* The first clause is equally clear. We have already shown what its prohibitory part can not mean, from other portions of the Confession, where the language covers all the special subjects in debate, and therefore brings them all within the term "ecclesiastical." What the prohibitory part of the first clause and the prohibitory and permissive parts of the middle clause do mean, is also clear. They must refer to matters which all agree are strictly "civil," and to them exclusively. And what is said about them?—that they must not be touched at all by the church? By no means. On the contrary, the very language employed says they *may* be—even they!—and tells how it may be done. It says, in the clearest terms, that "synods and councils" *may* entertain even "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," in the "way of humble petition in cases extraordinary;" or, to state it in another form, as permission is here given to do a particular thing in a particular way and under particular circumstances, all which are pointed out, the prohibition can not refer to the subject-matter of the thing, but only to a violation of the conditions stated. If this construction be objected to, all we need to say, is, that it is not merely the only one which the language grammatically admits, but the only possible one of which the case itself is susceptible, from its own nature, as here presented. Taking, however, any other construction, if there should be any other which is admissible or even possible—any conceivable one which will preserve the authors of this document from the most direct and positive self-stultification—and still, the Confession sustains the main proposition on which the whole discussion proceeds; and what is not to

* Here is an illustration: "Ministers may be present at Parliaments with the Book of God in their hands, if they be required to answer any doubt; nor ought the Estates make any act concerning religion, or the affairs of the kirk, without the advice and consent of her representative body, the National Assembly."—*Scot's Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation* (1597).

be overlooked, is the fact that our position is thus fully sustained by the only portion of the entire Confession which is produced for its overthrow.*

Here, then, the case as to this Confession might be permitted to rest. But we are willing to pursue it a little farther for the sake of vindicating our construction, by showing that the framers of the Confession meant in this section precisely what their language imports. We do not wish to leave them under the apparent imputation of saying, for our convenience, one thing while they mean another, nor do we wish to rest under the imputation of misunderstanding either their language or its intent. We desire also to illustrate the correctness of our view by showing that the churches both in this country and in Europe have done the very thing which by this construction is authorized, viz.: "petitioned" the civil "powers that be" in regard to "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth." Taking the two main features of the section, we analyze it thus:

First—In declaring that "synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical," the framers of the Confession undoubtedly had in mind the long and bitter conflicts between the church and the state, and the final domination of the spiritual over the civil power almost universal in Europe for ages previous to the Reformation; and

* A possible objection to the explanation given to this section may be made out of the use of the word "intermeddle." If "synods and councils," it may be asked, "are not to *intermeddle* with civil affairs," does the permission given in the words, "unless by way of humble petition, in cases extraordinary," allow them to "intermeddle," provided they do it under these conditions? Undoubtedly it does. This word does not necessarily mean officious or unwarranted intrusion, though now most commonly so used. Many instances might be given of its use in former times in the sense of rightful interference; and it is no unknown thing that some other important words of this Confession have a meaning in the present popular apprehension different from their original import. One instance, showing a change in the meaning of "intermeddle," will suffice. Bishop Burnet, in his "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England," in commenting upon Art. XXXVII, "Of Civil Magistrates," where he is defending the right of the Sovereign to the headship of the Church of England, says: "The second is, that kings or queens have an authority over their subjects in matters ecclesiastical. In the Old Testament, the kings of Israel intermeddled in all matters of religion." That they did "intermeddle," the Bishop regards as an argument in his favor. He refers to the fact approvingly, using the word in the sense of just interference.

also the naturally resulting influences prevailing for a long time after the Reformation, and then continuing more or less in every country where the union of church and state remained, and to some extent even among those who had thrown off the trammels of the civil power. With the lessons of history before them, and wishing clearly to bound the jurisdiction of the church within true Scriptural limits, they say that the church may "handle or *conclude* nothing but that which is ecclesiastical." Of course, "synods and councils" are left to decide in the fear of God, what is "ecclesiastical;" and all within that scope they may consider and *determine*, solely and finally. Let us illustrate. Even the doctrines of the Confession, on many vital points of theology, can not be understood by us without keeping in mind that they took their present verbal form with reference to these two objects: (1.) To exhibit the truth in a didactic manner; and, (2.) To stand as an enduring protest against certain prominent heresies, previously existing, or current at the time. The same principle marks those parts of the Confession which relate to civil and spiritual jurisdiction. The passage just cited was drawn with this double intent. While, as explained by other chapters, the term "ecclesiastical" covers all those subjects which we contend for, as coming within the complete jurisdiction of the church; on the other hand, the prohibition, though stating the truth didactically and directly, is a standing protest against that towering spiritual usurpation (with all its progeny, lineal or collateral, wherever found), which for so many ages meekly placed its foot upon the necks of the sovereigns of Europe.

Second—In saying that "in cases extraordinary," "synods and councils" may entertain even "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, by way of humble petition," the authors of the Confession mean just what they say—"civil affairs" strictly so called. There can be no doubt that this is the plain force of the terms. What, then, could the framers have had in mind? (1.) Although the state and the church, as such, have distinct jurisdictions, yet, neither the church in separate denominations or congregations, much less the church as a whole, in any country, whether religion in any form is established or not, is so entirely distinct from the state, as not often to be affected by its legislation, or by the execution of its laws,

in matters strictly civil, and sometimes to its great injury. The state and the church are made up largely of the same persons. In their most vital concerns for this life, the interests of the whole people of any nation are inseparably blended. The acts of the civil power affect all, for weal or woe; and the character of the church, as pure or corrupt, as true to her mission or departing from it, not only affects the body itself, but the outside world, and the civil government and temporal affairs of every nation where the church is planted. Our fathers undoubtedly had in view these inseparable civil and spiritual interests, and the inevitable acting and reacting of the civil and spiritual powers upon each other, when they declared that "synods and councils" might, "in cases extraordinary," in the form of "humble petition," make known their desires to the civil rulers, even upon "*civil* affairs which concern the *commonwealth*"—that is, not merely the state as such, but the *common weal*, or welfare, of the whole body of the people. They were not to "handle or conclude" anything of this nature; they could do that, only in matters "ecclesiastical;" but they might "petition," in great emergencies, upon purely "*civil* affairs." Moreover, it is a fact of no small importance, confirmatory of this interpretation, and showing the meaning of all that part of the Confession we have under consideration, that it was framed by men, of whom some in the Westminster Assembly, both civilians and divines, were connected with church establishments, and all composing the body were from countries where civil and spiritual affairs, as actually administered, were closely interwoven in the conceptions, habits, and daily life, of the whole people. And although this Confession, as we have it in the United States, is somewhat modified to suit our different circumstances, especially in the chapter relating to civil magistrates, still, the section in hand is word for word as originally adopted at Westminster. This may be explained in part by the well-known fact that some of the leading men in the old Synods of New York and Philadelphia, out of which the General Assembly grew, and who at first adopted our standards, were from those countries where the influences we have spoken of had so much to do in forming the habits of thought and expression of even those who are not connected with any

established church, upon all subjects of ecclesiastical law relating to the boundaries between the civil and spiritual jurisdictions. They had sometimes observed, however, in common with the members of the Westminster Assembly, certain matters relating to "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and which affected also the church, brought before the spiritual courts; and sometimes these cases were pressed to a dangerous and injurious length. In order, therefore, to avoid these evils, they aimed to narrow down this feature of the law to the lowest proper limits; and hence the original framers, and the fathers in this country following them, restricted the church in all "civil affairs," to "humble petition in cases extraordinary." This we suppose to be a fair view of the circumstances under which this provision of law was framed, and this we suppose to be its true intent. And therefore we repeat, that our fathers did not in this section say one thing and mean another. Neither may any construction be put upon it which shall destroy what they have so fully expressed elsewhere. In this part of the Confession as in all others they weighed their words. They said what they intended, and meant what they said. (2.) Cases have occurred on both sides of the Atlantic which illustrate this to be the meaning of the law, by showing that the church has acted under this provision as now construed. The civil power has often legislated upon matters coming within its jurisdiction—upon "civil affairs" strictly—and yet in a way to be oppressive to the church. Examples of this are found in the Test Oaths, Tithes, Acts of Uniformity, and other exclusive measures, applying to England and Scotland, under which large religious bodies have been disfranchised; and various societies of Dissenters in England, and the Established and other churches in Scotland, have often remonstrated "by way of humble petition, in these cases extraordinary." Contests have thus been engendered between the civil and spiritual powers, which embrace some of the most stirring events of history, than which none are more familiar to the world. So, in our country, has the church taken the same view of this statute, and acted under it. A noted case is that where the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church "petitioned" the Congress of the United States on the subject of Sunday *

mails. The Assembly regarded the subject-matter of the case to be a "civil affair," over which Congress had sole jurisdiction. This is evident both from the fact and the matter of her "petition;" and yet, the Assembly remonstrated with Congress against the Sunday mail service, because she regarded it to be her duty to do so as a member of Christ's body whose mission is to instruct all people, of all jurisdictions, rulers and ruled, in the will of God. This case, therefore, comes within and illustrates that section of the Confession we are considering. It is one of those "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and yet one which "synods and councils" may act upon "by way of humble petition," and one upon which, under this statute, our General Assembly has acted several times.*

* The Assembly took formal action upon the subject for five consecutive years, from 1812 to 1816, urging upon Congress, among other reasons, the great blessings, in a civil and temporal point of view, which would follow a proper observance of the Sabbath: "That the Sabbath contributes to increase the amount of productive labor, to promote science, civilization, peace, social order, and correct morality; * * * as it restrains mankind from those vices which destroy property, health, reputation, intellect, domestic peace, and national integrity and industry; thus preventing that ignorance and profligacy which tend to reduce the body of the people to poverty and slavery, by throwing the property and power of the nation into the hands of a few:" and that, "in the apprehension of the petitioners, the transportation and opening of the mail on the Sabbath is injurious to the morals and civil welfare of this nation." The Assembly further say: "Works of necessity, such as arise out of extraordinary circumstances, or such as are unavoidable for the support and comfort of life, together with works of charity, are admitted to be lawful, for God delighteth in mercy rather than sacrifice." The Princeton Review, in 1831, at the time when numerous petitions were again presented on this subject, in an elaborate vindication of the petitioners, concedes that the matter of determining the case was strictly "civil," being wholly within the jurisdiction of Congress. The writer is replying to another reviewer who had impugned the motives of the petitioners, and says: "He himself has placed the whole subject on its proper basis. He tells us that Sunday, in this country, is to be respected by the people and government, as a day devoted to rest and worship, except where public or private necessity forbids. And, consequently, the whole question about the mail, is, whether this necessity exists. If this be once made out, there is not a Christian in the land who would utter a syllable of objection. * * * If stopping the mail on Sunday would occasion all the inconvenience which is predicted, they would bear their full share of the burden." As a matter of course, the question of "necessity" and of "inconvenience," upon which the whole case is made to turn, must be finally determined by Congress, that purely "civil" power which alone has jurisdiction of the subject. It is, therefore, in that sense, solely a "civil affair."

We commend the whole matter concerning this section of the Confession to that class of ministers and elders, who have adopted and sworn to abide by it, and yet who are sometimes found in Synods and in the General Assembly, sincerely we do not doubt, quoting it, and perverting it to improper ends. We may endeavor, for example, if we think proper, to induce "synods and councils," even the General Assembly, to "petition" Congress, or the President, to stop the present war and make peace. This would be perfectly legitimate. It would be acting within the statute under consideration. This war is a "civil affair" solely, and one which most intensely "concerns the commonwealth," in the sense of the "weal of the whole body of people in a state;" and also, the "commonwealth" in the sense of "a free state, a popular or representative government, a republic," for its existence in this sense is involved in the issue of the struggle. It is a "civil war," upon the whole matter of the continuance or close of which the "civil power" alone is to consider and determine. It is within its sole jurisdiction. The spiritual power can not determine it. It can not "handle or conclude" war or peace. It is expressly debarred by the statute. And yet, may not the church, if she think fit, "petition" on this subject, when the interests involved concern so deeply all classes of society, and so much cripple her own energies? She is as expressly permitted by the statute in this case as she is debarred in the other. The case is sufficiently "extraordinary," for the world has seen nothing like it before. It is one of the very cases for which such a provision was made. In referring to it, we aim only to expound and illustrate the law fully and fairly.

We now dismiss the Westminster Confession, with the confidence that it fully sustains the position we have taken, as to the province of the pulpit and the functions of church courts upon the matters under consideration; and we find, too, that our position is more than supported by the very section which alone was thought completely to invalidate it.

All the leading Confessions extant in the evangelical world, agree with the Westminster, in ascribing to the spiritual functions and jurisdiction of the church all that we have ventured to claim, except those which place some of the churches which are legalized and established by the state, so completely under

the ban of the civil authority as almost entirely to crush out their spiritual life and render their testimony through their standards or otherwise, nugatory and worthless. We here mention the most prominent of the Confessions of the Evangelical Church Catholic, and give extracts, from which it will be seen that they are all in harmony with our position. Such are the Former and Latter Confessions of Helvetiæ, the Confession of Basle, those of Bohemia, France, Scotland, Belgæ, Augsburg, Saxony, Wirtemberg, Sueveland, the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, the Westminster, as originally adopted, the Second Book of Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, and others. These are among the fruits of the Reformation. The earlier Confessions or Creeds were chiefly confined to brief statements of some principal doctrines, in a form to meet particular errors. Such were the Apostles' Creed (so-called); the Athanasian, as commonly termed, though high authority say, "falsely called the Athanasian Creed;" the Nicene Creed, etc. In none of these is found any Article upon the subject under discussion. There was then apparently no call for it. And even during eleven or twelve centuries following, although some twenty or more General Councils were held (the Ecumenical character of some was denied), commencing with that of Nice, A. D. 325, and coming down to that of Pisa, A. D. 1511; although every subject, important and trivial, relating to doctrine and worship, seems to have been discussed and settled in them, from the Trinity down to the errors of the "Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit," so that it would not be amiss to say of several of them as of the Council of Constance, A. D. 381, that "they anathematized all the heresies then known," and passed, too, upon nearly all doctrines; and notwithstanding bitter contests between the civil and ecclesiastical powers raged for many years before the Reformation, and though Louis XII. of France proposed a series of questions to a convocation of his clergy, at Tours, in 1511, to which he received formal replies, touching the civil and spiritual jurisdictions, occasioned by his war with the Pope; still, there was no clear and full setting forth of Scripture doctrine on this subject in any formal Creed or Confession, till the period of the Reformation. But when the church emerged from the long night of the

Dark Ages, during which the lines indicating the true relations of the civil and ecclesiastical powers had been practically blotted out, and their separate functions usurped and commingled, it became quite as necessary for the instruction of the Reformed Churches, and to save them from future perils, that the powers of the civil magistrate, and the boundaries of the civil and spiritual jurisdictions, should be clearly defined, as it was that the special doctrines of grace should be distinctly and formally declared. Hence, we find this a feature, and forming a separate Article, in all the Confessions of that and subsequent times. We give a sample of them, in the order, chronologically, of their adoption. Some dwell upon the subject with much more fullness than others. The historical account of these Confessions, abridged, and the extracts, are for the most part taken from Hall's *Harmony of the Protestant Confessions*, London, 1842:

I. *The Confession of Augsburg.* This was presented to the Emperor Charles V., and published in Latin and German, at Wirtemberg, in the year 1530. "ART. 16.—Concerning civil affairs, they teach, that such civil ordinances as be lawful, are the good works and ordinances of God: as Paul witnesseth, 'The powers that be are ordained of God.' * * * Wherefore Christians must of necessity obey the magistrate's laws that now are, save only where they command and set forth any sin; for in such case they must obey God rather than men."

II. *The Confession of the Four Cities*, or as it is sometimes called, *The Confession of Sueveland.* This was presented to the same Emperor, in the same year, in German and Latin, by the ambassadors of the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Meiningen, and Linden. CHAP. 23, OF SECULAR MAGISTRATES.—In former places we have declared that our preachers do place that obedience which is given unto magistrates, among good works of the first degree; and that they teach, that every man ought so much the more diligently to apply himself to the public laws, by how much he is a more sincere Christian, and richer in faith. In the next place, they teach, that to execute the office of a magistrate, it is the most sacred function which can happen unto man from God."

III. *The Confession of Basle*, called also *The Confession of Mulhausen.* It was written in 1532, in German, by the ministers of the church of Basle, and subscribed also by the pastors of Strasburg. In 1561, it was again recognized by the ministers of Basle; afterward published by the magistrates of Milan, as the Confession of that church; and subsequently turned into Latin. "ART. 7. OF MAGISTRACY.—Moreover,

God hath assigned to the magistrate, who is His minister, the sword and chief external power, for the defense of the good, and for the revenging and punishment of the evil. Therefore every Christian magistrate (in the number whereof we also desire to be), doth direct all his strength to this; that among those which are committed to his charge, the name of God may be sanctified, his kingdom may be enlarged, and men may live according to his will, with an earnest rooting out of all naughtiness."

IV. *The Former Confession of Helvetia.* This was written about 1536, in behalf of all the churches of Helvetia, and sent to the assembly of divines at Wirtemberg, by Bucer and Capito. In 1537, it was propounded to the assembly of Smalcald, by Bucer, "and allowed of that whole assembly, namely, of all the divines and degrees of Protestants," as Luther testifies in his Letters to the Helvetic Churches. It was published in German and Latin. "ART. 26. OF MAGISTRACY.—Seeing that every magistrate is of God, his chief duty (except it please him to exercise a tyranny) consisteth in this: to defend and protect religion from all blasphemy, and, as the prophet teacheth out of the word of the Lord, to put in practice, so much as in him lieth. * * * Secondly, to judge the people according to just and divine laws, to keep judgment and justice, to maintain the public peace, to cherish the commonwealth, and to punish offenders, according to the quality of the fault, in their estate, person, or life; which thing when he doeth, he performeth a service due to God. We know that, though we be free, we ought with true faith holily to submit ourselves to the magistrate, both in our body and in all our faculties, and with endeavor of mind also to perform faithfulness, and the oath which we made to him, so far forth as his government is not evidently repugnant to Him for whose sake we do reverence the magistrate."

V. *The Confession of Saxony.* This was written in Latin in 1551, by Melanethon, for the Saxon Churches. It was subscribed by the Saxon, Meissen, and many other churches, as if to the Confession of Augsburg repeated. As it was drawn up with the express design of being presented to the Council of Trent, it may be well to quote it more at large. "ART. 23. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—By the benefit of God, this portion of doctrine also, concerning the authority of the magistrate that beareth the sword, and concerning the authority of laws and judgments, and of the whole civil state, is godlily set forth: and by great travail, and in many writings, the manifold and great furies of the Anabaptists and other fanatical men are refuted. We teach, therefore, that in the whole doctrine of God delivered by the Apostles and Prophets, the order and degrees of the civil states are avouched; and that magistrates, laws, judgments, and the lawful society of mankind, are not by

chance sprung up among men; and that, although there be many horrible confusions, which grow from the devil, and the madness of men, yet that the lawful government and society of men is ordained of God; and that whatsoever order is yet left by the exceeding goodness of God, it is preserved for the church's sake. * * * Therefore, in themselves they are things good, to bear the authority of a magistrate, to be a judge, to be a minister of judgments, to use judgments lawfully, to make lawful wars, and to be a soldier in lawful wars, etc. And a Christian man may use these things as he useth meat, drink, medicines, buying and selling. Neither doth he sin that is a magistrate, and dischargeth his vocation, that exerciseth judgments, that goeth to war, that punisheth lawfully those that are condemned, etc. And subjects owe unto the civil magistrate, obedience, as Paul saith: not only because of wrath, that is, for fear of corporal punishment, wherewith the rebellious are rewarded by the magistrate; but also for conscience' sake, that is, as rebellion is a sin that offendeth God, and withdraweth the conscience from God, Rom. xiii: 5. This doctrine we propound unto the churches, which establisheth lawful authority, and the whole civil state; and we show the difference of the Gospel and the civil government. God would have all men to be ruled and kept in order by civil government, even those that are not regenerate; and in this government, the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God toward mankind are most clearly to be seen. His wisdom is declared by order; which consists in the discerning of virtues and vices, and in the associating of mankind under lawful governments, and by contracts arranged in marvelous wisdom. Then the justice of God appeareth in civil government, in that He will have open sins to be punished by the magistrates. * * * Neither doth the Gospel condemn or overthrow commonwealths or families. And although it belongeth not to those that teach in the church, to give particular laws of politic government, yet the word of God doth generally teach this of the power of the magistrate. *First.* God would * * * by the voice of the magistrate, have sovereign and immutable laws to be propounded, forbidding the worship of idols, blasphemies, perjuries, unjust murders, wandering lusts, breach of wedlock, thefts, and frauds in bargains, in contracts, and in judgments. *The Second duty.* Let the magistrate be an observer of these divine and immutable laws, which are witnesses of God, and chief rules of manners, by punishing all those that transgress the same. For the voice of the law, without punishment and execution, is little available to bridle and restrain men. * * * *The Third duty* of the civil magistrate is to add unto the law natural, some other laws, defining the circumstances of the natural law; and to keep and maintain the same, by punishing the transgressors: but at no hand to suffer

or defend laws contrary to the law of God or nature ; as it is written, 'Woe be to them that make wicked laws.' For kingdoms are the ordinance of God, wherein the wisdom and justice of God (that is, just laws) ought to rule."

VI. *The Confession of Wirtemberg.* This was drawn up in 1552, in Latin, and presented by the Duke of Wirtemberg and Tecca, through his ambassadors, to the council of Trent. The doctrine of this, on Magistracy, differs little from the foregoing.

VII. *The Confession of France.* This was first presented in French, in 1559, to Francis II, King of France, "in behalf of all the godly of that kingdom." It was presented, in 1561, to Charles IX. In 1566, it was published in Latin by the pastors of the French Churches, "to all other evangelical pastors." Though it is much the same with the preceding, yet as they were confined chiefly to the German Churches, and this concerns one of the principal kingdoms of Western Europe, we insert a few sentences. ART. 39. We believe that God would have the world to be governed by laws, and by civil government, that there may be certain bridles, whereby the immoderate desires of the world may be restrained ; and that therefore He appointed kingdoms, commonwealths, and other kinds of principalities, whether they come by inheritance, or otherwise. * * * Therefore, He hath also delivered the sword into the hands of magistrates ; to wit, that offenses may be repressed, not only those which are committed against the second table, but also against the first. Therefore, because of the Author of this order, we must not only suffer them to rule, whom He hath set over us, but also give unto them all power and reverence, as unto His ambassadors and ministers, assigned of Him to execute a lawful and holy function. * * * Therefore, we affirm that we must obey the laws and statutes, that we must pay tribute, and patiently endure the other burdens ; to conclude, that we must willingly suffer the yoke of subjection, although the magistrates be infidels, so that the sovereign government of God do remain entire, and nothing diminished."

VIII. *The Confession of the Church of England.* This was inserted in the general Apology written by John Jerrell, Bishop of Sarum, in behalf of the English Churches, in 1562, and "agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true religion." "ART. 37. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.—The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions ; unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

* * * We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of sacramenta; * * * but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

IX. *The Latter Confession of Helvetia.* This was written by the pastors of Zurich, in 1566, and approved and subscribed by the Tigurines, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangallia, Rhetia, Mulhausen, and Bienne, and also by the churches of Geneva, Savoy, Poland, Hungary, and Scotland. "CHAP. 30. OF MAGISTRACY.—The magistracy, of what sort soever it be, is ordained of God himself, for the peace and quietness of mankind; and so, that he ought to have the chiefest place in the world. * * * His chiefest duty is, to procure and maintain peace and public tranquillity. * * * Let him govern the people committed to him of God, with good laws, made according to the word of God. * * * Let him exercise judgment by judging uprightly; let him not accept any man's person, or receive bribes. * * * Let him repress, yea and cut off such as are unjust, whether in deceit or by violence. 'For he hath not received the sword of God in vain.' Therefore, let him draw forth this sword of God against all malefactors, seditious persons, thieves, or murderers, oppressors, blasphemers, perjured persons, and all those whom God hath commanded him to punish or even to execute. * * * But if so be it be necessary to preserve the safety of the people by war, let him do it in the name of God; provided he have first sought peace by all means possible, and can save his subjects no way but by war. * * * For as God will work the safety of his people by the magistrate, whom he hath given to be, as it were, a father of the world; so all subjects are commanded to acknowledge this benefit of God in the magistrate. * * * Finally, let them pay all customs and tributes, and all other duties of the like sort, faithfully and willingly. And if the common safety of the country and justice require it, and the magistrate do of necessity make war, let them even lay down their life and spend their blood for the common safety and defense of the magistrate; and that in the name of God, willingly, valiantly, and cheerfully. For he that opposeth himself against the magistrate, doth procure the wrath of God against him. We condemn, therefore, all contemnors of magistrates, rebels, enemies of the commonwealth, seditious villains and, in a word, all such as do either openly or closely refuse to perform those duties which they owe."

X. *The Confession of Belgia.* This was published in French, in the name of all the churches of Belgia, in 1566; and in 1579, in the public Synod of Belgium, was repeated, confirmed, and twined into the Belgian

tongue. ART. 36.—We believe that the most gracious and mighty God did appoint kings, princes, and magistrates, because of the corruption and depravation of mankind; and that it is his will that this world should be governed by laws, and by a certain civil government, for punishing the faults of men, and that all things may be done in good order among men. Therefore, he hath armed the magistrates with the sword, that they may punish the wicked and defend the good. * * * Moreover, all men, of what dignity, condition, or state soever they be, ought to be subject to their lawful magistrates, and pay unto them subsidies and tributes, and obey them in all things which are not repugnant to the word of God."

XI. *The Confession of Bohemia*, sometimes called *The Confession of the Waldenses*. It was published in 1573, in many places, and approved by the University of Wirtemberg. A former one, substantially corresponding with this, was published as early as 1532, and approved by Luther and Melancthon. "CHAP. 16. OF THE CIVIL POWER, OR CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—Furthermore, it is taught out of holy Scripture, that the civil magistratē is the ordinance of God, and appointed by God; * * * and is maintained to govern the people in those things which appertain to the life of this body here upon earth. * * * And that in regard to their duty they are especially bound hereunto, and that this is their peculiar charge, that they cherish among the people, without respect of persons, justice, peace, and all good things that appertain unto the time; that they protect and defend their peaceable subjects, their rights, their goods, their life, and their bodies, against those that wrong and oppress them, or do any ways indamage or hurt them; also, that against the unjust violence of the Turks, together with others that do the like, they do succor and defend them; and so serve the Lord God herein, that they bear not the sword in vain, but valiantly, courageously, and faithfully, use the same to execute the will and works of God therewith. * * * Moreover, the people also are taught concerning their duty, and by the word of God are effectually thereunto enforced; that all and every of them, in all things (so that they be not contrary unto God), perform their obedience to the superior power."

XII. *The Confession of Scotland*. This was first presented to and allowed by the three estates in Parliament, at Edinburgh, in 1560; again ratified at the same place, and on the same authority, in 1567; and finally subscribed by the King and his household, at Holyrood House, January 28, 1581. It is generally supposed to be the production chiefly of John Knox. "ART. 24. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—We confess and acknowledge empires, kingdoms, dominions, and cities, to be distincted or ordained by God; the powers and authority in the same, be it of emperors in their empires, of kings in their realms, dukes and

princes in their dominions, and of other magistrates in their cities, to be God's holy ordinance. * * * We farther confess and acknowledge, that such persons as are placed in authority, are to be beloved, honored, feared, and holden in most reverend estimation. * * * And therefore, we confess and avow, that such as resist the supreme power doing that thing which appertaineth to his charge, do resist God's ordinance, and therefore can not be guiltless. And farther we affirm, that whosoever deny unto them their aid, counsel, and comfort, whilst the princes and rulers vigilantly travail in execution of their office, the same men deny their help, support and counsel to God, who, by the presence of his lieutenant, doth crave it of them."

XIII. *The Confession of the Church in Ireland*, "agreed upon by the Archbishop and Bishops, and the rest of the clergy of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin, in 1615," etc. Art. II. Of the Civil Magistrate, is almost verbally that of the 37th Article of the Church of England, adopted in 1562.

XIV. *The Synod of Dort*, which was in session in 1618-19, adopted articles on five principal doctrines, not embracing, however, the subject of Civil Magistracy.

XV. *The Confession of the Westminster Assembly*; "agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, with the assistance of the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, as a part of the Covenanted Uniformity in Religion betwixt the Churches of Christ in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; examined and approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, anno 1647, and ratified and established by Act of Parliament, anno 1649." The only difference between this Confession as modified and adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and as originally adopted at Westminster, on the subject of magistracy (in so far as previously quoted), is in the following section from the earlier form: "CHAP. 23. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.— * * * 3. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church; that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

XVI. *The Second Book of Discipline*: or Heads and Conclusions of the Policy of the Kirk of Scotland:—"Agreed upon in the General

Assembly, 1578; inserted in the registers of Assembly, 1581; sworn to in the National Covenant, revived and ratified by the Assembly, 1638; and by many other acts of Assembly; and according to which the Church Government is established by law, anno 1592 and 1690." This account and the extracts here given are taken from the "Pardovan Collections." The only change made is in the orthography. "CHAP. 1. * * * The civil power is called the power of the sword, and the other the power of the keys. The civil power should command the spiritual to exercise and do their office according to the word of God; the spiritual rulers should require the Christian magistrate to minister justice and punish vice, and to maintain the liberty and quietness of the kirk within their bounds. The magistrate commandeth external things for external peace and quietness among the subjects; the minister handleth external things only for conscience' cause. * * * The ministers exercise not the civil jurisdiction, but teach the magistrate how it should be exercised according to the word." This Second Book of Discipline contains much more that is valuable to our purpose, but want of space forbids further extracts."*

An apology may seem to be due for this extended quotation of Confessions upon a single point; but we wished to exhibit the testimony of the whole Protestant world upon the subject

* *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, hold this doctrine: ART. 87. OF THE POWER OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.—The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted."* In the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, is found: ART. 28. OF THE RULERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—The President, the Congress, the General Assemblies, the Governors, and the Councils of State, *as the delegates of the people*, are the Rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitutions of their respective States. And the said States are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction." In a note to this Article, in the Discipline, it is said: "As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially of all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and therefore, it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under the British, or any other government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects." We need not quote from other church Confessions in the United States. The doctrines held by all of them, on the subject of Civil Magistracy, and the duty of obedience thereto, are substantially the same as those here given, and those of the Evangelical Churches of all countries.

in hand. No better testimony to the sentiments of the church at large upon any point of scriptural doctrine can be found than exists in her elaborated Confessions. The only comment needed is to call attention to the specific points here made. These various denominations of the Church Catholic, spread over the whole Christian world, claim it to be within their province, and of their express authority and duty, from the word of God, as enjoined by their common Head, the Lord Jesus Christ,—1. To set forth the province, authority and duty of civil rulers, both positively and negatively, showing the derivation, nature, grounds, obligations, and limits, of their functions and power; 2. To enjoin upon the people obedience to civil rulers, and show the nature, grounds, and conditions, of that obedience; 3. Although these formulas differ somewhat upon the province of civil rulers, and as to the precise line of demarkation between the civil and spiritual functions, yet they all agree in these two points—all that are essential to our argument—(1.) That the church may and should declare, from God's word, what the functions of civil rulers, as such, are; and (2.) That God has thus placed, in this sense, the spiritual above the civil power; the whole showing, 4. That these various denominations of the Evangelical Church Catholic, in thus expounding the word of God, do not deem that they are interfering in matters political and forbidden to them, but are only discharging a high spiritual duty which is of the very essence of their commission, and whose fulfillment is of the highest importance to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the church and of all mankind. The only inference we draw from all this, is the very obvious one, that those subjects, which the whole Christian world, through their Confessions, thus declare to belong to the province of the church—provided these formulas are correct in their expositions of this portion of divine truth—the pulpit and church courts everywhere, may and should entertain, according to the leadings of God's providence and the emergencies of the case. And here we leave the Confessions.

We come now to another important part of the argument from authority, illustrating the proposition which we have aimed to establish. This may be called the testimony from the *Acts and Deliverances of the Church*. It would be quite strange,

after the full elaboration given to the general subject in hand, in the Creeds and Confessions of the church at large, if we did not find some illustration of the doctrine therein set forth, in the action of the church, through her judicatories. We do, however, find testimony of this character, on a variety of special subjects, marking her whole history, in all parts of the world. The chief obstacle we encounter is, that these illustrations are so abundant, that we find it difficult to make a selection. Volumes are filled with them. In the midst of this mass of testimony, it is quite likely that we may omit some cases that would illustrate our subject more strikingly than some of those we shall present.

In regard to this testimony it should be understood, that we do not assume that the church gave a proper deliverance, as to its special subject-matter, in any case to be cited. That point has nothing to do with the present issue. It is not essential to our argument. Whether right or wrong in the matter of any deliverance, the simple fact that the testimony was given shows the authority which the church claimed in the premises; and that she claimed and exercised the authority to speak at all on the subjects considered, is the point which sustains our position. Nor should any unjust suspicion be thrown upon the subject-matter of these deliverances. The fact, however, that the honored fathers of the church made them, shows that they judged they had the right, and that under the circumstances it was their duty, to speak as they did; and upon this simple point—what the word of God demanded of them as ministers, and what lies within the true province of the church,—they were probably quite as well informed as some of their children. With these suggestions in mind, let us look at a few cases of their testimony as samples of many. We may take the Presbyterian Church in the United States as illustrating the position of other ecclesiastical bodies in our country; sometimes, indeed, unfortunately for them, in the way of contrast.

In 1756, before the formation of the General Assembly, the Synod of New York, out of which in part the Assembly was formed, put forth a Pastoral Letter upon the French War, in which the Synod take decided ground, and urge the people to pray for and sustain "their rightful and gracious sovereign, King George II. his royal family, all officers civil and military,"

against the French, whom they denominate "a potent, prevailing, and cruel enemy." This is quite explicit. They exhort the people to sustain the government in prosecuting the war against their public enemies, and did not deem, that in doing so, they were going beyond the proper functions of the church.

Just ten years later, in 1766, the Synod sent out a congratulatory letter to the churches, upon the repeal of the Stamp Act, in which they exhort the people to manifest their joy "by a cheerful and ready obedience to civil authority." And they further say: "We most earnestly recommend it to you, *to encourage and strengthen the hands of government*, to demonstrate on every proper occasion your undissembled love for your mother country, and your attachment to her true interest, so inseparably connected with our own."

In 1775, the same body issued a Pastoral Letter upon the Revolutionary War. They first exhort the people to express "attachment and respect to our sovereign, King George, and to the revolution principles by which his august family was seated on the British throne"—thus indorsing a revolution in the government of England, by which the house of Stuart was overthrown and the house of Hanover elevated to power. Then they urge the people to sustain the revolution progressing in this country, in this language: "Be careful to *maintain the Union* which at present subsists through all the colonies; nothing can be more manifest than that the success of every measure depends upon its being inviolably preserved; and therefore, *we hope that you will leave nothing undone which can promote that end*. In particular, as the Continental Congress, now sitting in Philadelphia, consists of delegates chosen in the most free and unbiassed manner, by the body of the people, let them not only be treated with respect, and encouraged in their difficult work—not only let your prayers be offered up to God for his direction in their proceedings—but adhere firmly to their resolutions; and let it be seen that they are able to bring out the whole strength of this vast country to carry them into execution."

If those eminent fathers of the church, convened in the council of her highest court—Witherspoon (who afterward signed the Declaration of Independence), and Rodgers, and Caldwell, and Halsey, and Ogden, and others—could thus exhort

the people to sustain the Congress sitting in Philadelphia, in the great struggle which resulted in *establishing* the United States Government, and making us a nation among the nations of the earth; shall it be deemed, in our day, secular and political, and a profane prostitution of church authority, for the courts of the church to exhort men to stand by the administration sitting in Washington, in the far greater struggle now made to *preserve and perpetuate* this same government and nationality, not against a foreign foe, but against a godless and causeless rebellion? *

In 1789, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church unanimously adopted an Address congratulating Gen. Washington on his election to the Presidency of the United States; and this address called forth from the great captain and statesman a reply which does honor to him as a man, a patriot, and a Christian. We give barely two sentences from this address, made "To the President of the United States:" "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America embrace the earliest opportunity in their power, to testify the lively and unfeigned pleasure which they with the rest of their fellow citizens feel, on your appointment to the first office in the nation. * * * We shall consider ourselves as doing an acceptable service to God, *in our profession*,

* But is this, indeed, a "rebellion," which is now raging against the National Government? Some are afraid of using the word, and deem it harsh to apply the term "rebels" to "our Southern brethren." And some go so far as to draw a parallel between them and our fathers of the Revolution of 1776. Men of the South have done this from the first. Let us appeal to history and to high authority. Robert Treat Paine, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, says of Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, who preached in Boston and published a sermon on Civil Government, some years before the Revolutionary War, that he was "The Father of Civil and Religious Liberty in Massachusetts and America." John Adams is called one of Dr. Mayhew's political disciples; and from the instructions of the master, the scholar said, in 1775, in defense of resistance to the despotism of the British Government: "We are not exciting rebellion. Opposition, nay, open, avowed resistance by arms, against usurpation and lawless violence, is not rebellion by the law of God or the land. *Resistance to lawful authority makes rebellion.* Hampden, Russell, Sydney, Somers, Holt, Tillotson, Burnet, Hoadley, &c., were no tyrants nor rebels, although some of them were in arms, and the others undoubtedly excited resistance against the tories." This is to the point. The men of '76 were not "rebels." The present opposition in the South is "to lawful authority," in a free, elective government. That "makes rebellion"—deep-dyed and unpardonable.

when we contribute to render men sober, honest, and industrious citizens, and the *obedient subjects of a lawful government.*"

The action of the General Assembly is very explicit on many subjects of state legislation: as, for example, in petitioning Congress against governmental desecration of the Sabbath in carrying the mails on that day; in adopting some five or six papers, more or less elaborate, on slavery, running through a period of more than seventy years;* in passing resolutions, on many occasions, in favor of African colonization; in indorsing organizations for the promotion of temperance; in taking action upon theaters, and upon lotteries, "condemning the practice of gambling by lottery, under the sanction of legislative patronage;" and acting on a variety of other kindred subjects; in all of which the church condemns or approves these secular matters, according to their moral and religious bearings, though countenanced, or established, by direct action of the civil authority.

These things, thus fully interwoven with the whole history

* Prof. David Christy, of Cincinnati, has published, within the past year, an octavo of more than six hundred pages, entitled "Pulpit Politics; or Ecclesiastical Legislation on Slavery, in its disturbing influences on the American Union." He has done the public some service in collecting a mass of statistics and authorities, which may be of use in many ways; but the argument of the book, as a whole, is a total failure. His premises are false, his reasoning erroneous, and his conclusion what might be expected. He assumes that the church has no business to take any action on Slavery; that to do so is to meddle with "politics;" and he calls it "ecclesiastical legislation in civil affairs." These are his premises, and from these he reaches a foregone conclusion. But his admissions overturn his premises, reasoning, and all. He admits, or rather insists, that Slavery is found in the Scriptures; that the duties of master and servant are defined therein; that the relation is sanctioned of God; in a word, that Slavery is a divine institution. This is quite enough. If all this be so, then the subject is at once removed from the exclusive domain of the secular and political into the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical, for the latter covers all that is contained in the Scriptures. If it be once granted that the subject is found in the word of God, and that his will upon it is there made known, it must follow that the church is authorized and bound to express that will. This is the view which our church has taken, and upon this ground it has many times spoken. If the church acts erroneously on this subject, it is to be lamented, just as though she should erroneously expound a doctrine of salvation. But if the subject be in the word of God, in any shape, the church may act upon it. Prof. Christy's logic, that, because the church has acted wrong or fanatically, and the result has been strife, schism, and rebellion—even admitting all this to be so—*ergo*, the church should not have touched the subject at all, is entirely unworthy of being dignified with the name of reasoning.

of the Presbyterian Church in this country—and similar action has been taken by other ecclesiastical bodies—have given the church a character before the world, and fixed the status of the church upon the proposition we have laid down.

So far as our reading extends, while there was some difference of opinion as to what action should be taken in some of these cases, and as to the expediency of taking any action at all, no man in this high court is known to have contended, until within a very few years past, that action upon such subjects was without the true province of the church, an assumption of unwarranted authority on her part, and a perversion of her functions. Certain it is, that no action was ever taken by the General Assembly sustaining this view. Such ground, however, was openly taken in the General Assembly of 1859, at Indianapolis, by some leading men from the extreme South, in the debate on the proposal to recommend the American Colonization Society; and the doctrine then announced, that the church has no authority to act upon such matters, was regarded as a new doctrine in the church. It was pronounced, in terms, "a new doctrine," and "novel to the rising generation of Christians," in the Quarterly Reviews emanating from Princeton and Columbia, in their notice of the debates in that Assembly, the former condemning and the latter approving the doctrine.* And the remotest period to which an able

* Dr. Hodge in the Princeton Review, says: "These remarks are made with the obvious purpose to prevent the hasty assumption that the General Assembly gave its sanction to the *new and startling doctrine on the church*, which Dr. Thornwell so eloquently advocated. * * * We pray God that this poison may be dashed away, before it has reduced the church to a state of inanition, and delivered her bound hand and foot into the power of the world. * * * It is only on the assumption that Presbyterians, neither in this country nor in Europe, have ever understood their own system, that the principle advocated by Dr. Thornwell can be admitted." On the same subject, an anonymous writer in the Southern Presbyterian Review, says: "The eloquent debater (Dr. Thornwell) embraced the only opportunities that were given to announce a doctrine, not new, indeed, but most important, and *comparatively novel to the rising generation of Christians*." And even Dr. Palmer, while defending the doctrine in this Review, substantially concedes its novelty, thus: "It was something, however, to have had those principles so clearly enunciated in the hearing of the whole church; and we may rest assured the end is not yet. Attention being so publicly called to the question—what is the true nature and province of the church of Christ—it must continue to be agitated until a final and satisfactory response is given in some formal and authoritative utterance, so soon as the church shall be prepared to render it."

writer in the latter periodical refers, in the history of our church, to relieve the doctrine of entire novelty as to any church action, is to the Assembly of 1848. But so far from sustaining the position that the church may not act upon these questions, that very Assembly, in the very case referred to, affirms that the church has full authority so to act. The minute was made, in an elaborate report to the Assembly, upon a proposal to recommend the American Temperance Union, wherein the Assembly explicitly sanction the principle we contend for, in speaking of Colonization, Temperance, and other similar institutions, in these plain words:

"When they proclaim principles that are scriptural and sound, it is not denied that *the church has a right*, and under certain circumstances *may be bound, to bear testimony in their favor*; and when, on the other hand, they inculcate doctrines which are infidel, heretical, and dangerous, *the church has a right to condemn them.*"

This is as direct and unequivocal a testimony to the point under consideration, as could be put into human language; and when it is taken in connection with the action of the Assembly a few years before, wherein the Assembly say, "that they cordially approve and rejoice in the formation of temperance societies; * * * that they earnestly recommend, as far as practicable, the forming of temperance societies in the congregations under their care; * * * and that, as friends of the cause of temperance, this Assembly rejoice to lend the force of their example to the cause, *as an ecclesiastical body*;" whatever may be thought of the "cause" itself here commended, or the expediency of commending it, it is plain that all this action sustains most fully the proposition we have laid down; while it fixes the birth of this child of the imagination, so far as its name appears before any high court of record—and then only in an eloquent declamation—at the General Assembly of 1859. The bantling is thus not four years old; and it has never been circumcised, or had ecclesiastical baptism. Its recent origin, its notorious paternity, its bold avowal, are all well remembered; and though to some men the *animus* which was thought to prompt the movement was then impenetrable, the terrible events which have so speedily followed, in the state and the church, largely through the early

lead and co-operation of these same men, have lifted the veil from before all eyes but those of the willfully blind.

Now, it matters not whether this testimony from the deliverances of the church be deemed of the least possible value, or otherwise. The argument is not rested upon it. That stands upon the immovable ground of Scripture. This testimony is cited merely as an illustration of the views of the church. As such it had a certain value—small, in the comparison, it may be; infinitely less than nothing, if it conflict with the word of God—but yet, it is an unbroken testimony of its kind, beginning with the origin of our church in this country, and coming down, without a single flaw in any link of the chain, to the action of the last General Assembly of the year of grace, 1862; and generally, these deliverances have been enacted with great and frequently with entire unanimity.

We may follow this testimony of the church in this country, with that of a similar character from the action of church courts in Great Britain and among the churches of Continental Europe. The Scotch Churches, both Established and Free, with all the smaller branches of the Presbyterian family in Scotland, and the English Dissenting Churches, abound in illustrations of it. The principle runs through all the strata of their perilous and thrilling history, and crops out into frequent action of their highest courts, in all their conflicts with the usurpations of a corrupt hierarchy and the encroachments of the civil power. Every reader especially of Scottish history is familiar with it. Scotland's novelists have told its story in their entrancing fiction, and Scottish bards have embalmed it in song. It is too well known to be in any manner of doubt; and yet it may be well to give a few examples. We take them all from the Scotch Church, especially because that church in its polity more nearly resembles the Presbyterian Churches in the United States. They are chiefly from Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, and other publications of the Wadrow Society, Edinburgh edition. The only change made in the quotations is that the orthography is modernized.

The Reformation having been settled on a substantial basis, and the Confession of Faith for the Scotch church, drawn up mainly by Knox, having been "read in the face of Parliament,

and ratified by the three Estates of Edinburgh, the 17th day of July, 1560," the first General Assembly of the "Reformed Kirk of Scotland," was held at Edinburgh on the 20th day of December of the same year. The Assembly met twice in each year, commencing with 1561, down to 1567. In the last named year it met three times. In 1568 it convened once, but was prevented from meeting a second time, "in respect of the stormie weather, and the brute of the plague." In 1569 it held two meetings, and in 1570 it held two. We pass by all these meetings of the highest judicatory of that church but the last, in the records of each of which is found matter for the illustration of our subject.

At the twenty-first General Assembly, held at Edinburgh, on the 5th of July, 1570, among the "Acts" passed was the following :

"5. *It was ordained*, That as it pleased God of his mercy to erect the authority of the King's Majesty, with public consent of the Estates, even so the same ought and should be universally obeyed throughout this realm, without acknowledging any other authority, whatsoever title be pretended. Moreover, that ministers, after their public sermons, pray publicly for the preservation of his Majesty's person and authority; with certification that all such as shall be found negligent or disobedient shall be punished, as the Assembly shall think expedient. Further, it was declared, that if any subject or subjects of this realm, of what Estate soever they be, shall take upon them presumptuously to inhibit any minister to obey the ordinance of the General Assembly, what cloak or color soever he or they pretend, or by menacing make impediment unto them, so that ministers may not without fear serve God in their vocation, that in that case such troublers shall be summarily, upon the notoriety of the fact, excommunicated, and shall be holden rotten members, unworthy of the society of Christ's body. And, last, the Assembly commendeth all superintendents and commissioners of provinces, to cause this determination to be published in all the parish kirks, that none hereafter pretend ignorance. *It was ordained*, That this act should be printed by Robert Leekprevick, that it might come to the knowledge of all men. The superintendent of Lothian's letter, agreeth best with this time. *Item.—It was statute and ordained*, By reason of the great trouble lately raised by defection of some from the King's Majesty's lawful authority, that certain brethren be sent from the Assembly to all earls, lords, barons, and other gentlemen, that have made defection, as said is, to draw them by all means possible to the

lawful obedience of his Majesty; and to certify them that disobey, the Assembly will use the sword against them, which God hath committed unto them."*—*Culderwood, Vol. III., p. 3.*

Let it be here observed, that the Assembly enjoin, in this Ordinance, as a religious duty of ministers and people, (1), Obedience to the lawfully established supreme civil authority; (2), That all ministers "pray publicly" in their churches for the preservation of this authority; (3), That those who neglect these duties should be punished; (4), That all "troublers" of the ministry in the execution of these duties, should be excommunicated; (5), The Assembly send a committee to those who are guilty of "defection" from obedience to the civil authority, to exhort them to return to their duty, and to warn "them that disobey" the Assembly's mandate, that they will excommunicate them; (6), And, finally, that this ordinance should be read in every church of the realm.

If such a Scriptural statute were put in force in the United States to-day—nearly three hundred years further along, though we boast of being in the march of civilization and religion—what large numbers who now preach the Gospel would instantly lose their commissions! and how many others would be excommunicated from the church!

The twenty-seventh General Assembly convened at Edinburgh, on the 6th day of August, 1578. "Alexander, Bishop of Galloway, was summoned by Mr. John Row, commissioner for Galloway, to appear before this Assembly," when the following among other charges were made:

*That is, "the sword" of excommunication. The "Superintendent of Lothian's letter" referred to, "was penned by Mr. Knox" for the superintendent. In this letter, he says that it "pierceth many hearts" among them, "to see the hands of such as were esteemed the principal within the flock, to arm themselves * * * against a just and most lawful authority, and against the men who looked of them not only quietness and peace, but also maintenance and defense against all invasion, domestical and foreign. The consideration of this their most treasonable defection from God, from his truth professed, and from the authority most lawfully established, causeth the hearts of many godly to sob and mourn." He exhorts all such, "that they deeply consider their fearful defection from God, and from his lawful magistrates, by his word and good order erected within this realm; and that they, by condemnation, and public confession of their folly, travell (labor) speedily to return again to the bosom of the Kirk, and to the obedience due unto the magistrates, from which they have most traitorously declined."

—*Culderwood, Vol. II., p. 482.*

"*Secondly*, That the said Mr. Alexander taught the people most perverse and ungodly doctrine ; but specially, in persuading, enticing, and exhorting, to rebel against our sovereign lord, and to join with manifest rebels and conjured enemies. *Thirdly*, The said Mr. Alexander, contrary to the act of the General Assembly made for the prayer of our sovereign lord, etc., most maliciously transgressed the said ordinance, not only refusing to do the same, but also avowing in his prayer another authority, and accusing and condemning all true ministers that did not the like that he did. * * * *Fifthly*, The said Mr. Alexander being sworn by his solemn oath, for due obedience to our sovereign lord, and his Grace's regent and authority, came in the contrary thereof, and violated and brake his said former oath, but specially sitting in a pretended parliament, for dispossessing of our said sovereign lord of his royal crown and authority. *Sixthly*, The said Mr. Alexander, being one of the pretended Privy Council, after the horrible slaughter of Matthew, Earl of Lennox, regent to our sovereign lord, of good memory, gave thanks for the same, and other such like, in pulpit openly to God ; and exhorted the people to do the same, saying, it was God's most just judgment that fell upon him ; and as God then began to execute his most just judgment upon him, he would not fail to execute the same upon the rest ; comparing oftentimes our said sovereign lord, his regents and true lieges, to Pharaoh and wicked Absalom, and himself to Moses and David whom God would defend. *Lastly*, By reason that the heinous faults of the said Mr. Alexander have been so notoriously known to all men, * * * to the great and heavy slander of God's true word and professors thereof ; wherethrough many of the said professors, and others our sovereign lord's true and obedient subjects, same time by him perverted, yet still remain in their wicked conceived error, and can scarce be persuaded in the contrary, except the said Mr. Alexander be caused to confess his error publicly, in all places where he hath offended : but specially in all the aforesaid kirks."—*Calderwood, Vol. III., p. 289.*

Here were charges of refusing to pray for the lawful government, as a previous Assembly had ordained ; openly aiding rebellion, and leading the people into it, by preaching and praying in its behalf, and recognizing a rebel government ; violating his oath of allegiance, etc. The "said Mr. Alexander" pleads to this indictment, "the godly Act of Pacification, made by the procurement of the Queen's Majesty of England, with consent of my lord regent's Grace," under which he claimed to be absolved by the civil power ; and, on

the other hand, while not denying the facts charged, he pleads to the jurisdiction of the spiritual court: "Therefore, your Wisdoms can be no competent judges of us, or any of us, contained in the aforesaid Act of Pacification; * * * neither can your Wisdoms have further jurisdiction over me, nor over the rest of the communicants contained in the said Act of Pacification, for the causes aforesaid." The Assembly, however, did not admit the plea, but proceeded to pass sentence, requiring public confession and repentance, prescribing the period within which it must be made, and enjoining him "to obey the aforesaid injunctions, under the pain of excommunication; with certification, that if he obey not, the Assembly commandeth the minister of Edinburgh or Holyrood House to proceed to excommunication against him. * * * The bishop was enjoined to obey before the 20th day of September, and Mr. Roger to send this ordinance, duly executed, before the said 20th day of September, to the kirk of Edinburgh, as he would be answerable to the General Assembly." This was something beyond action *in thesi* upon treason and rebellion against the civil authority.

The thirty-sixth General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 24th day of April, 1578. This body proclaimed a Public Fast to be observed in all the churches. Among the reasons assigned for appointing it, were, the "ungodly sedition and division within the bowels of this realm; * * * for these causes, and that God of his mercy would bless the King's Highness and his regiment, and make him to have a godly and prosperous government, as also, to put in his Highness' heart, and in the hearts of his noble estates in Parliament, * * * to make and establish good and politic laws, for the weal and good government of the realm."

The forty-third General Assembly was held in Edinburgh, commencing on the 17th day of October, 1581. This Assembly had a case of "preaching politics" before it, as it would be termed in our day by some declaimers; and so King James thought, but the Assembly judged otherwise. It was charged that Mr. Walter Balcalquall "had said in the pulpit, that within these four years, popery had entered into the country, not only in the court but in the king's hall, and was maintained by the tyranny of a great champion, who is called

Grace; and if His Grace would oppose himself to God's word, he should have little grace." Reference is made here to His Grace the Duke of Lennox, cousin to the king; and the charge is made before the Assembly in the King's name.

"Mr. Walter craved license to answer," and "praised God that he was not accused of anything wherein, either civilly or criminally, in his life and conversation, he had offended the King's Majesty or his laws, whereunto, with all reverence, and at all times, he is ready to submit himself; but is accused of things he hath spoken publicly in the pulpit, wherein he hath been more plain in reprov'g of vice than some men can goodly suffer; which is a point of his doctrine, which howbeit he heareth there called open slander, yet he must justify the same; that, although all the kings in the earth would call it erroneous, yet he is ready here by good reason to prove it to be the very truth of God; and, if need require, to seal it with his blood. * * * Wherefore, with all reverence, he would submit himself *simpliciter* to their goodly judgments always."

The Assembly "desired his Majesty to send commissioners to see this matter tried, seeing the Assembly is most willing to try the same." This desire was twice expressed through a committee, but "the king and council were so occupied that the brethren directed got no answer." Mr. Walter made no denial of the facts charged, but simply claimed his right as a minister to utter what he had done. After hearing the whole case, "the Assembly voted, and without contradiction declared, that he had uttered nothing in that sermon erroneous, scandalous, or offensive, but solid, good, and true doctrine; for which they praised God." And thus the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland judicially sanction this "mixing of politics and religion" in the pulpit! and praise God for the mixture! *

*As a specimen of the sermon thus approved, and embracing a portion of what was complained of, we give the following: "And now, brethren, to be plain in this matter, while they that fear God ripely consider these things, they are compelled to fear these things to be the fruits of our French court, which, if they be, I pray God keep us from the like, or worse. For if these things continue and go forward, I will tell thee, O Scotland, and these that fear the Lord within thee, thou shalt repent that ever this French court came into Scotland, or that ever thou saw it, or the fruits thereof, with thy eyes. * * * Secondly, Whereas, our King's Majesty, from his infancy, was trained and brought up in the fear of God, and by the mercy of God yet continueth thereunto; where before, no profane person durst come in his Grace chamber or presence, his Grace's ears are now offended

The forty-eighth General Assembly convened in Edinburgh, on the 10th day of October, 1583. This was the last Assembly in regular, uninterrupted succession, which was held during the period immediately under consideration; and the last that can be regarded as strictly free in the enjoyment of its spiritual functions, by reason of the encroachments of civil power. No Assembly was held in either of the years immediately following, viz., 1584 and 1585. For several years previous, Jesuit and Erastian influences had been at work, by which the reformation had been rolled backward and the "noble old kirk" again well nigh brought into bondage. These things our subject did not require us to notice. During these sad and troubled times, the Assembly was striving, by "petitions," "supplications," and an exhibition of "greeses," to maintain its full, spiritual jurisdiction; while the enemies of the truth were equally zealous, and more successful, in their endeavors to put upon the neck of the kirk the yoke of vassalage to the state. The king was beset by both parties, and at times seemed to favor each. At this Assembly, an earnest appeal was made to him, and a long list of "Articles" submitted for his sanction, showing that the Assembly still spoke out boldly upon corruptions in the state, and pleaded earnestly that the jurisdiction of the church might not be farther invaded, but fully restored. In these Articles, she speaks as follows:

"SIR: The strait commission we have received of the Eternal, our God, when as in this your Majesty's realm we were made watchmen of his people, and fearful threatening pronounced against such as neglect faithfully to execute every part of their weighty charge, compelleth us, presently to have recourse unto your Majesty, perceiving many things to fall forth greatly to the prejudice of God's glory, and no small appearance of utter wreck of this his kirk and commonwealth, unless some hasty remedy be put thereto; most humbly, therefore, beseeching your Majesty diligently to weigh and consider these few heads, which, with all reverence and observance, we present, looking for a gracious answer, and speedy redress thereof." Passing by the first three heads,

by a profane French ruffian, who, if he were in any other reformed country, would rather be hanged before the sun, than to be suffered to pollute the ears of so good and so godly a young prince; who, if he were not removed in time, they that fear God will repent that ever they saw him, or them that brought him here."

—*Calderwood, Vol. III., p. 774, Appendix.*

in which the Assembly speak of the advance of Popery, they "mix politics and religion" as follows: "That your Majesty seemeth to have over good liking of the enemies of God, as well in France as some within this realm, who have never given testimony of any good meaning, either in religion or in your Majesty's service; beside the dissolute life, and irreligious behavior of them that, in your Grace's service, have succeeded to men that were known zealous in God's cause, and faithful to your Grace in your tender age. * * * There is a sore murmur among your Grace's lieges, and a lamentable complaint that the laws of the country have no place; that no man can be sure, neither of his land, life, or goods, which threateneth a miserable confusion, and the heavy hand of God to ensue thereupon; that oftentimes your Majesty interponeth your Highness' authority, by letters of harning, to stop the execution of the acts made in the General Assembly, in matters properly belonging to the kirk, and nothing touching the civil estate.* *Last*, We most humbly beseech your Majesty to suffer us to lament this great division among your Highness' nobility and subjects, the one part seeking by all means possible to wreck the other; which fostereth a continual strife, malice, and rancor, to the great danger of your Grace's person, whom God preserve to the kirk of God and this poor country; beseeching your Majesty, for the tender mercy of God, to call to your Highness some of the most wise, discreet, and indifferent, and by their counsel to take a moderate course, that unquiet spirits may be bridled, good men cherished and entertained, and the hearts of all your Majesty's subjects united, to the maintenance of God's glory, preservation of your royal estate, and comfort of all them that bewail this miserable condition."—*Culderwood, Vol. III., p. 734.*

While the Assembly here express their undoubted loyalty, and urge their suit with becoming humility, it will be noticed that it is with great plainness of speech and commendable faithfulness that the spiritual court addresses the civil power. Nor did the Assembly for a moment suppose that in the subject-matter of their address they were treading on forbidden ground. In reply to these Articles of the Assembly, the king sent a very respectful letter, noticing each head in detail, and covering a much larger space than the Assembly's paper. He made many fair promises, and could he have been freed

* "Letters of harning," in Scottish law, are a process issued from a court of competent jurisdiction in the name of the king, against a debtor or for other claim, requiring the claim to be liquidated within a time named, under penalty of incurring the charge of rebellion against the state.

from his counsellors and flatterers, he perhaps would have fulfilled them. With becoming deference, he writes to the Assembly: "The Tenth head being general, his Majesty would be glad not only to have it explained, but to hear all good advices that shall be offered to him, for reformation of that which may be found amiss; and how his laws may have place, and justice be ministered, to the comfort and common benefit of all his good subjects."

As before stated, after the forty-eighth General Assembly, in 1588, whose acts we have just noticed, the body did not convene for two years. The encroachments of the civil power, forbidding the Assembly to meet without the king's express authority, and postponing the day named for meeting from time to time, seriously invaded the freedom of the church; and when at length the meetings were again held, corruption within the body had become so widespread, through Jesuit intrigues and promotion by the favor of the king and his council, that a majority were frequently found ready to do the king's bidding, while a few faithful men protested in vain, receiving a reward in imprisonment or exile. Walter Balcanquhall's prophecy was now rapidly being fulfilled: "If these things continue and go forward, I will tell thee, O! Scotland! and these that fear the Lord within thee, thou shalt repent that ever this French court came into Scotland, or that ever thou saw it, or the fruits thereof, with thine eyes!"

As a slight evidence of the deterioration of the kirk, as seen in its highest court, we notice an act of the General Assembly, convened at Dundee, on the 24th of April, 1593. The order of proceedings was now reversed, and instead of the Assembly expressing its will in Articles to be sent to the king, as formerly, we find the king dictating to the Assembly acts for its adoption. A long list appears, entitled, "The Articles propounded in his Majesty's name to the General Assembly, presently convened at Dundee." We give but a brief extract:

"His Majesty declareth, that in respect he can not of honor see his crown hurt, therefore he will have regard to see the act of his Parliament kept concerning the convening of the General Assemblies by his Majesty's appointment. * * * Secondly, His Majesty desireth them to make an act of their Assembly, prohibiting all and every one of the

ministry, under the power of deprivation, to declaim against his Majesty or council's proceedings in pulpit, not only in respect to his Majesty's known good intention for the furthering of piety and justice, but likewise, because his Majesty at all times giveth ready access and loving care to sundry of the ministry, to inform, debate, or complain, either in their own name, or in the name of any of the rest of the brethren."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 242.*

The Assembly shows its ready compliance with the king's will, by the "humble answers" returned. In regard to the meeting of the body, it assents, "according to the tenor of the act of Parliament," allowing the king to name the time and place; thus surrendering, without a struggle, with some honorable exceptions, a right which in previous years it strenuously claimed to belong to its sole jurisdiction. But the most noticeable part of its proceedings is its prompt acquiescence in the restriction which the king desired to have put upon the pulpit.

"As touching the second Article, it is ordained by the whole Assembly, that no minister within the realm utter from the pulpit any rash or unreverend speeches against his Majesty or council, or their proceedings; but that all their public admonitions proceed upon just and necessary causes, and sufficient warrant, in all fear, love, and reverence, under the pain of deposing such as do in the contrary from their function and office of the ministry."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 244.*

At the very next General Assembly, convened in Edinburgh, on the 7th day of May, 1594, a case of "preaching politics" came before the body, under the foregoing Article which they had adopted at Dundee, in the preceding year. The charge was brought at the instance of the king, and the whole proceedings in the case, detailed at great length, reveal on the one hand a desire to comply with their own statute and meet the wishes of the king, and on the other a still lingering conviction of the true province of the spiritual authority, and the obligations of the pulpit to be faithful to its mission. They appoint a committee of thirteen, of whom Walter Balcanquhall (whose similar case, decided in his favor thirteen years before) was one, "to treat upon the offense conceived by the king against John Rosse." The committee report:

"1. In respect he delivered that doctrine, at that time, when his Majesty's rebels and enemies were assembled in the fields; wherethrough it might appear to the people that the kirk allowed Bothwell's treasonable attempts, and that the Assembly, of purpose, had placed him in that room, to alienate the hearts of his people from his Majesty's obedience. * * * 3. In respect to the hard delivery of speeches spoken of his Majesty, which might have been thought to have craved greater years and farther experience. Further, the whole brethren, both of the conference and of the Provincial of Perth, all in one voice acknowledged, that there is just cause of a sharp rebuke, and threatening of heavier judgments forth of the grounds of that text, than hath been or might have been uttered by him; and whatsoever he uttered, as he deposed before God, and upon his conscience, he uttered it out of love, seeking always his Majesty's standing; of no preoccupied mind, pre-judged opinion, or troubled affection, but of a soul thirsting, and seeking always his Majesty's honor and weal in God; and therefore approves his whole doctrine in that point, as it has been read and declared by himself, in such heads as seem to be most offensive. * * * And being minded to satisfy his Majesty always, so far as possible may be with a good conscience, after earnest incalling of the name of God, for assistance of his Spirit, and long advisement, have found it good that the admonition of the Provincial of Perth, as said is, be revered of the said whole General Assembly; and that the General Assembly at this time, give farther the said John Rosse a grave and earnest admonition to speak at all times reverently, and with such wisdom of his Majesty, as he always may have so clear a warrant of his speeches as may fully satisfy his own conscience before God, and have the approbation and allowance of all the godly brethren. And that this admonition be extended to all other young men of the ministry, and to the whole Assembly." So far the report of the committee of thirteen; of which the Assembly say: "Which judgment of the said brethren being well considered by the whole Assembly, after good deliberation, voted to the approbation of their said judgment, and allowed the same in all points. And thereafter, the said John Rosse being called in, * * * the Moderator, at command of the said Assembly, in the name and fear of God, admonished the said brother, and all other young men of the ministry, and the whole Assembly, in all time coming, to speak so reverently and discreetly of his Majesty, that they may have so clear warrant of their speeches as may fully satisfy their own conscience before God, and have approbation and allowance of all the godly, and his Majesty have no just cause of complaint and misliking in time coming. Which admonition the said John with all humility revered."—*Calderswood, Vol. V., p. 321.*

The plain English of the foregoing Scotch is, that the As-

sembly yet retained so strong a sense of what was demanded of them as a spiritual court, and of what was due to the sacredness of the pulpit, which they were set to guard, that they "approved" the said John's "whole doctrine" complained of; but yet, "being minded to satisfy his Majesty always," they punished the said John by administering through the Moderator, "a grave and earnest admonition!" And then, apparently, to ease the matter a little from the shoulders of the said John, they punish in like manner "all other young men of the ministry!" And then, to satisfy their consciences for having inflicted this gratuitous punishment, they gravely conclude to visit it upon themselves; and so "the Moderator, at the command of the said Assembly," "admonished the whole Assembly!" And to make thorough work of the matter, so that they would not have it to do over again, the punishment of all of them was inflicted for "all time coming!" And the whole winds up with the important record: "Which admonition the said John with all humility revered." But whether the others relished their punishment is not found in Calderwood.

The king seemed scarcely to have anticipated such prompt compliance with his will in the case of John Rosse, and therefore sent to this Assembly, before he had been made aware of their action, another long list of "Articles proposed in his Majesty's name to the said General Assembly at Edinburgh," in which he reiterates his will upon points previously submitted, and presents others. The matter of fettering the pulpit was a vital point with him. Not feeling confident that the act touching this point passed during the previous year at Dundee, under which the said John had been both acquitted and punished, would be carried out in good faith, the King urges upon the Assembly, "that they will ratify and approve, by act of this present Assembly, their promise made to his Majesty in their foresaid last Assembly," that the ministry should "not utter publicly in pulpit any unreverend speeches against his Majesty's person, council, or estates, under the pain of deprivation;" and then he presents the following:

"3. That they will excommunicate Mr. Andrew Hunter, for bringing in a scandal upon their profession, as the first open traitor of their faction, against a Christian King of their own religion, and their natural

sovereign. 4. That by act of the Assembly, they will ordain every particular minister within their charge to dissuade, as well by public as private exhortation, the flocks committed to their care, from concurring with the treasonable attempts of Bothwell, or any other traitors that arise, or shall raise themselves up, against the lawful authority placed by God in his Majesty's person; and specially, that they shall narrowly take heed and not suffer any of their flocks to be seduced, under color of religion, or whatsoever false pretexs, to receive wages or become soldiers for service of any persons, except they see his Majesty's commission and warrant thereunto; and namely, of Bothwell, who has presently, in divers parts of this realm, attempted the same."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 325.*

The Assembly's action, sent to the King, upon the points noted above, is as follows:

"2. The act made by the General Assembly at Dundee, is, *de novo*, ratified and approved. 3. Touching Mr. Andrew Hunter, the Assembly hath proceeded and given a sentence of deposition for his offence against him, until he satisfy his Majesty and the Kirk. 4. Every particular minister, within his charge, is straitly commanded to dissuade their flocks, as well by public as private exhortations, from concurring with the treasonable attempts of Bothwell, or any other traitor to his Majesty, that raiseth or shall raise themselves up against his authority. And such like to take heed, and suffer not their flocks, under color of religion, or whatever false pretexs, to receive wages of any persons without his Majesty's warrant; and namely, of the said Bothwell." Upon this action of the Assembly, the historian remarks: "Mr. Andrew Hunter was deposed from the function of the ministry, because he deserted his flock, was fugitive from the laws, and was bruted and suspected to have joined himself with the King's rebels; and that till he satisfied the King and the Kirk for his offence. He had followed Bothwell, and being forced to leave the country, became a minister unto soldiers in the low countries."—*Calderwood, Vol. V., page 324, et seq.*

If anybody's portrait is here drawn, leaving out the single lineament of "deposition," the artist is Calderwood. Though painted from life, nearly three hundred years ago, it is a life-like picture of certain ministers of the present day. If the duty of pastors to their flocks, "as well by public as private exhortations," is here "straitly commanded;" and if the duty of church courts in case of the delinquency of pastors in the premises is here set forth by example in an instance of

actual deposition, and more especially in case pastors by "private exhortations" exert a contrary influence among their flocks; all this is done by the venerable Kirk of Scotland, whose wisdom in the department of church polity, some among us are accustomed, and justly, so much to admire and commend.

In the year 1595, the General Assembly met at Montrose, on the 24th of June. In this Assembly, "an ordinance upon treason" was adopted, wherein they declare "against practitioners of any treasonable enterprise or conspiracy against his Highness' person or estate, being found and declared culpable thereof by law, that they therefore shall incur the sentence of excommunication; the General Assembly agreeth thereunto, *legitima cognitione, ecclesiastica præcunte.*"—*Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 368.*

We find similar testimonies in the action of many more General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, but these will suffice. The Acts and Deliverances which we have cited, from the supreme judicatory of a church, to which, in the department of government and discipline, the Presbyterian Church in the United States is more closely allied than to any other, sustain and illustrate with unquestionable plainness the doctrine we have attempted to establish. They show: (1). Most explicit commands to pastors and people to obey, support, and pray for, their lawful civil rulers. (2). Solemn and formal acts declaring and denouncing treason and rebellion. (3). Injunctions to pastors to instruct their flocks in the duty of obedience to civil rulers, and to warn them, publicly and privately, against countenancing or joining in treason and rebellion, under pain of excommunication for default therein. (4). Cases of actual deposition and excommunication, for commission of these sins and omission of these duties. (5). Decided rebukes by the Assembly itself of open sin in rulers, and solemn judgments sustaining pastors in such rebukes when judicially charged with fault for uttering them in the pulpit; with explicit pointing out to kings and all magistrates their religious duties, and an earnest assertion of the spiritual independence of the church, and firm remonstrances against the encroachments of the civil power. (6). And, finally, that in doing all this, the General Assembly did not deem that they

were going beyond their commission as a spiritual court, and meddling with politics; nor was this point made by any one of the body in any of their earnest discussions, but all conceded these to be among the most manifest duties of the church as imposed by her Divine Head and clearly enunciated in the Holy Scriptures.

In the light of these indisputable facts, is it strange, or is it not, that certain men who are specially enamored of the government and discipline of the Church of Scotland, can in this day overlook these fundamental principles which mark her whole history, or take an open position against their imitation by the church in the United States in this time of treason and rebellion, and denounce those who follow these noble examples, with "preaching and praying politics," and with "confounding the spiritual and civil jurisdictions," and with "mixing politics and religion?" No: it is not strange.

One point remains to fill the measure of testimony by which we proposed to illustrate the position we have taken. While it is so fully sustained by the action of church courts, it is further elucidated from the *Published Writings of Men of various branches and periods of the Church*, who are acknowledged as among the highest stars of the ecclesiastical firmament. As we have taken so much space upon other branches of the subject, we must be briefer than we could wish upon this. Volumes might be filled, or rather are filled, with this testimony. We will give a few instances.

The name of Robert Hall is one of the most illustrious of the British Church of any period or denomination. As a *pulpit instructor*, it is perhaps not extravagant to say that he has had few if any superiors in any age of the church. His works abound with matter to the point in hand. In aiming to show "the Relation Christianity bears to Civil Government," he says: "Though Christianity does not assume any immediate direction in the affairs of government, it inculcates those duties and recommends that spirit which will ever prompt us to cherish the principles of freedom." He further says: "As ministers are appointed to teach the whole compass of social duty, the mutual obligations of rulers and subjects will of necessity fall under their notice, and they can not explain and enforce the reasons of submission without

displaying the proper end of government, and the expectations we may naturally form from it; which, when accurately done, will lead into the very depths of political science." And still further: "On this principle do the Dissenters proceed, when they call for a repeal of the Test Act; when they lament the unequal representation in Parliament; when they wish to see a period to ministerial corruption, and to the encroachments of a hierarchy equally servile and oppressive." And Mr. Hall mentions among the bright names of those who coincide with him in the principles he is advancing, Owen, Howe, Baxter, and others, commending them as "some of the most devout and venerable characters that ever appeared," and who "held sentiments on the subject of government as free, and were as warmly attached to liberty," as any others in the world. We have not space to quote from these renowned men.—*Hall's Works, Vol. III.*

Do we go to Scotland? What better type of the status of the ministry of that realm upon the question in hand, marking two great eras of the Scotch Church, than Knox, the Melvilles, Davidson, and their coadjutors, of the former period, and Chalmers and his associates of a later day? An example or two must suffice. Says Dr. McCrie of the Scottish ministry of the Presbyterian Church as a body, in his *Life of John Knox, the heroic Reformer*: "They continued to profess not only their allegiance to their sovereign, but also their readiness to obey the Queen Regent, in everything not inconsistent with their security, and the liberties of the nation." In this spirit, Knox wrote for himself and his coadjutors, in one of the most troubled times in Scottish history, in the reign of the unfortunate Mary: "The Queen is retired to Dunbar. The end is known only to God. We mean no tumult, no alteration of authority; but only the reformation of religion and suppression of idolatry." At another time, Knox wrote: "In few words, to speak my conscience, the regiment of princes is this day come to that heap of iniquity, that no godly man can brook office or authority under them, but in so doing he shall be compelled, not only against equity and justice to oppress the poor, but also expressly to fight against God and his ordinance. * * * And what must follow hereof, but that either princes be reformed, and be compelled also to

reform their wicked laws, or else all good men depart from their service and company." To the Queen Dowager, after her suspension from the regency, he wrote: "my tongue did both persuade and obtain, that your authority and regiment should be obeyed of us in all things lawful, till ye declare yourself open enemy to this commonwealth; as now, alas, ye have done!" And Knox, in his several interviews with Queen Mary, sought and commanded by her, boldly laid down the principles which the class of her subjects he represented, felt bound to adhere to, as enjoined on them to maintain and teach others, involving the setting forth of the nature and principles of civil government in their relations to the church, in their pulpit ministrations. But this is all too familiar to need citation. The whole history of the Scottish Church and ministry of that period is but a vindication of the position we have taken.

A bold testimony to the right of the pulpit was uttered by John Davidson in 1596, in reply to King James the VI. of Scotland, and before the General Assembly. The king visited the Assembly in person, and took part in the proceedings, contending for his rights against the ministry. His speech is thus reported, with Davidson's reply:

"The king granted he was a sinner, as other men were, but not infected, he trusted, with any gross sin and therefore required, that no preacher would inveigh against him or his council publicly, but to come to him or them privately, and tell what is the offense; and as for himself, if he mended not, in case he were guilty, they might deal publicly: his chamber-door should be made patent to the meanest minister in Scotland; there would not be any mean gentleman in Scotland more subject to the good order and discipline of the kirk than he would be. For he acknowledged his standing to be joined with the standing of religion, and affirmed that he had never any intelligence with the common enemies, nor ever promised them countenance or aid." Mr. Davidson replied to the king, "concerning the duty of the ministry in reproving his Majesty." He said: "Ye hear, brethren, his Majesty's offer. Therefore, in the name of God I exhort you, discharge your duty at this time, seeing in this public defection, and now, when God is threatening us for the same, every estate hath its own gross sins, as we have already seen in the trials of the ministry; * * * otherwise, I protest, if ye fail therein, that we that are the servants of Christ, shall find fault both with you and his Majesty, as becomes us. But whether

yonder way that his Majesty speaketh of, by admonishing privately for open sin, and manifest continuing therein, if it be according to the word of God, ye are to judge. I speak this for the liberty of our message, that are Christ's servants, and as a free Scotchman, as ever I have been, and mean by God's grace so to die." This speech was so well received by the Assembly, that the historian says: "Mr. Davidson's freedom for the freedom of God's messengers, and that in the king's presence, before so frequent an Assembly, was so commended by the godly, that they wished it might be registered in the Assembly's books, for a testimony to posterity."—*Calderwood, Vol. V, p. 398.*

It was during this same year, that Andrew Melville, one of the Assembly's commissioners, appointed to look after the interests of the kirk, had his famous conferences with the king, in which he boldly asserted the rights of the ministry and the spiritual independence of the church. The king called a convention "of his estates" at Falkland. Ministers were invited to attend, but only "such as the king could dress for his purpose." Melville attended, though uninvited. The ministers were called in by name, after the king and the magnates were seated. Melville "was omitted, but he came in with the foremost." The king having expressed his disapprobation that he had come unbidden, Melville replied :

"Sir, I have a calling to come here from the King, Christ Jesus, and his kirk, who has special interest in this turn, and against whom this convention is directly assembled; charging you and your estates, in the name of Christ and his kirk, that ye favor not his enemies whom he hateth, nor go about to call home, and make citizens, these who have traitorously sought to betray their city and native country to the Spaniard, with the overthrow of Christ's Kingdom." And the historian adds: "And breaking on in particular upon the greatest part of that convention, with plain speech and mighty force of zeal, challenged them of the treason both against Christ and the king, and kirk and country, in that purpose and counsel they were about. The king interrupted him, and commanded him to go out; whose command he obeyed, thanking God that he had gotten his message discharged."—*Calderwood, Vol. V, p. 438.*

Soon after this, it becoming apparent that the purpose for which the convention at Falkland was called, was likely to be executed, the "commissioners appointed by the General Assembly to see to the dangers of the kirk at all occasions,"

consisting of Andrew Melville, Patrick Galloway, James Nicolson, and James Melville, "came to Falkland, where they found the king very quiet." The scene which followed is thus graphically described: "The rest laid upon Mr. James Melville to be speaker, alleging he could propone the matter substantially, and in a mild and smooth manner, which the king liked best of. And entering in the cabinet with the king alone, Mr. James shew his Majesty that the commissioners of the General Assembly, with certain other brethren, ordained to watch for the weal of the kirk in so dangerous a time, had convened at Cowper. At the which word the king interrupted him, and crabbedly querrelled their meeting, alleging it was without warrant, and seditious, making themselves and the country to conceive fear, where there was no cause. To the which, Mr. James, beginning to reply in his manner, Mr. Andrew could not abide it, but broke off upon the king in so zealous, powerful, and unresistible a manner, that howbeit the king used his authority in most crabbed and choleric manner, yet Mr. Andrew bore him down, and uttered the commission as from the mighty God, calling the king but God's silly vassal, and taking him by the sleeve, sayeth this in effect, through much hot reasoning, and many interruptions:

"SIR: We will humbly reverence your Majesty always, namely, in public; but since we have the occasion to be with your Majesty in private, the truth is ye are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and kirk of Christ is like to wreck, *for not telling you the truth, and giving you a faithful counsel; we must discharge our duty therein, or else be traitors both to Christ and you.* And, therefore, Sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, *that there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is Christ Jesus, and his kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James the Sixth is, and of whose Kingdom not a King, nor a head, nor a lord, but a member; and they whom Christ has called, and commanded to watch over his Kirk, and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power of him, and authority so to do, both together and severally, the which no Christian king nor prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise not faithful subjects, nor members of Christ.* And, Sir, when you were in your swaddling clouts, Jesus Christ reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies; and his officers and ministers convened and assembled, for the ruling and weal of his kirk, which was ever for your welfare, defense, and preservation: also, when these same

enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off; and, in so doing, by their Assemblies and meetings ever since, continually have been terrible to these enemies and most steadable for you. And will ye now, when there is more necessity of the continuance and faithful discharge of their duty (drawing to your own destruction, by a devilish and pernicious counsel), begin to hinder and dishaunt Christ's servants, and your best and most faithful subjects, querrelling them for their convening, and care that they have of their duty to Christ and you, when ye should rather commend and countenance them, as the godly kings and good emperors did? As to the wisdom of your counsel, which I call devilish and pernicious, it is this: that ye must be served with all sorts of men, to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant. And because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are over strong and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low, by stirring up a party to them, and the king being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to flee to him. So shall he be well served. But, Sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere and mad folly; for his curse can not but light upon it, so that, in seeking of both ye shall lose both; whereas, in cleaving uprightly to God, his true servants should be your sure friends, and he should compel the rest counterfootedlie and beinglie to give over themselves, and serve you, as he did to David." — *Calderwood, Vol. V., p. 440.*

When we come down to the period of another great Reformation in Scotland, that of the Exodus and of the establishment of the Free Church, in 1843, we find no brighter name than that of Thomas Chalmers. In his Lectures on Romans (chap. 13), in speaking of our obligations to the Civil Government, he says:

"It is a lesson altogether worthy of strenuous and repeated enforcement from the pulpit, from which there ought to be exposed and denounced with all fidelity, the shameful laxity which obtains in this department of moral obligation. It is a most befitting topic for the ministrations of a clergyman. * * * There is a hebetude of conscience on this subject which needs the quickening of an earnest and solemn and scriptural representation. This were not to secularize religion; but, what is mainly wanted, it were to sanctify the business of human life. * * * That is a fatal error which would dis sever the social from the sacred; or which looks in the great amount of them on the moralities of human conduct, though specified and prescribed in the Bible, merely in the light of so many weekday proprieties. * * *

A government in the discharge of its ordinary functions is a great blessing to society ; and it is upon this consideration that the duties of the passage now under review are grounded and enforced by the Apostle. * * * *Heaven grant an apostolic wisdom, as well as an apostolic boldness, on the part of her ministers—that they may acquit themselves rightly of all which they owe both to God and to Cæsar ; and so that, while faithful to their Master in heaven, their loyalty to the powers which be on earth, may, in all that is possible, and as far as lieth in them, become patent and palpable to all men."*

Similar testimonies may be found among all the leading Reformers of Continental Europe ; among the divines of England and Scotland of the seventeenth century, an age than which there is none richer in ecclesiastical lore ; and among the descendants of these men, of the present day, in every country under the whole heavens.

Dr. Hodge (*Princeton Review*, July, 1859) says : " It follows from the great commission of the church, that it is her prerogative and duty to testify for the truth and law of God, wherever she can make her voice heard ; not only to her own people, but to kings and rulers, to Jews and Gentiles. * * * If magistrates transcend the limits of their authority, and trespass on the divine law, she is bound to raise her voice in remonstrance and warning. * * * The whole history of the Presbyterian Church in Europe and America is instinct with this spirit."

We will summon but one more witness. The name of no minister in the early history of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, is held in higher estimation, for sound doctrine, for fervid eloquence, and for great success in the ministry, than that of Samuel Davies. His name is a household word among the Lord's people in Virginia, and his fame is well established on both sides of the Atlantic. Though born in what was then the Province of Pennsylvania, and in the latter part of his life President of the College of New Jersey (" Nassau Hall "), the larger part of his ministry was spent in Virginia. His biographer says of him :

" President Davies was an ardent and devoted friend of his country. He lived in the forming period of our history, and he exerted his great influence in vindication of his country's rights. The country was

alarmed and agitated to the highest degree by the French and Indian war, while he was a pastor in Virginia. There was even much talk of abandoning a part of the colony of Virginia to the enemy. On the 10th of July, 1755, General Braddock sustained his memorable defeat, and the remnant of his army was saved by the courage and skill of Colonel Washington, then only twenty-three years old. On the 20th of this month Mr. Davies preached a sermon, entitled, 'On the defeat of General Braddock, going to Fort Du Quesne.' * * * In August of the same year, he delivered a sermon in Hanover, to Captain Overton's company of independent volunteers, under the title of 'Religion and Patriotism the constituents of a good Soldier.' As a preacher, President Davies was eminently fitted to the times in which he lived. He was one of the great men whom God raised up at that time to impress their features on the age, and to mould the opinions of their countrymen. He was such a preacher as the times then demanded, and such a preacher, in the great features of his ministry, as this age also demands. * * * It will be an honor to tread in the footsteps of such men."

Thus far we have the view of his biographer, written more than twenty years ago, introducing to the public three volumes of his sermons. In this collection are some half dozen or more of what are called "Patriotic Sermons," preached within a period of three or four years, several in one year, and on the Sabbath, showing that President Davies frequently brought these subjects before the people. The titles, affixed by their author, are significant. Two are given above. Others are as follows: "The Curse of Cowardice;" and "The Signs of the Times;" and "On the death of his late Majesty, King George II.;" and "Serious Reflections on War;" and several others. Had he fallen into some hands in our day, these things would have stamped him as a "sensational preacher." But if these titles merit censure, the matter of his sermons still more. He would be called a "political preacher," and denounced as prostituting the pulpit, and his office to ends secular and profane. Let us see. Near the close of his sermon on the death of King George II., preached in the College of New Jersey, he says:

"The Christian can not but be a patriot. He who loves all mankind, even his enemies, must certainly love his country. The Christian can not but be a good subject. * * * 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.' This, my dear youth, this is the great precept of Christianity which this day demands your attention. From this day cherish

a public spirit, and dedicate yourselves to the service of your king and country. * * * This you must do, or turn rebels against your own hearts and consciences. * * * Then you will give the world an honorable and just specimen of the morals and politics inculcated in the College of New Jersey; and convince them that it is a *Seminary of loyalty* as well as learning and piety; a nursery for the state as well as the church. Such may it always continue! You all concur in your cordial Amen." In a sermon to Captain Overton's volunteers he said: "And, Virginians! Britons! Christians! Protestants! if these names have any import or energy, will you not strike home in such a cause? Yes, this view of the matter must fire you into men; methinks the cowardly soul must tremble, lest the imprecation of the Prophet fall upon him, 'Cursed be the man that keepeth his sword back from blood.' *To this shocking but necessary work, the Lord now calls you*, and, 'cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully'—that will not put his hand to it when it is in his power, or that will not perform it with all his might. (Jer xlviii: 10). * * * Let the event be what it will, it will afford us satisfaction to think that we have done the best we could. We can not command success; but let us do all in our power to obtain it, and we have reason to hope that in this way we shall not be disappointed; but if it should please God to render all our endeavors vain, still we shall have the generous pleasure to reflect, *that we have not been accessory to the ruin of our country, but have done all we could for its deliverance.*" At another time, he "preached to the militia of Hanover county, in Virginia, at a general muster, May 8, 1758, with a view to raise a company for Captain Samuel Meredith," when he said: "Is the work of peace, then, our only business? No: in such a time, even the God of Peace proclaims by his providence, 'To arms!' Then the sword is, as it were, consecrated to God; *and the art of war becomes a part of our religion.* Then happy is he that shall reward our enemies as they have served us. (Psalm cxxxvii: 8.) Blessed is the brave soldier; blessed is the defender of his country, and the destroyer of its enemies. * * * But on the other hand, our text says, "cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully; and cursed is he that keepeth back his sword from blood." * * * I am to lay before you a brief view of the present circumstances of our country, *which render the war in which we are engaged, the work of the Lord, which consecrate swords as instruments of righteousness, and call us to the dreadful but important duty of shedding human blood, upon penalty of falling under the tremendous curse of God.* * * * Such, my brethren, such alas! is the present state of our country: it bleeds in a thousand veins; and without timely remedy, the wound will prove mortal. And in such circumstances is it not our duty in the sight of God, is it not a work to which the Lord loudly calls

us, to take up arms for the defense of our country? Certainly it is: and cursed is he, who, having no ties sufficiently strong to confine him at home, keepeth his sword from blood. The man that can desert the cause of his country in such an exigency; his country, in the blessings of which he shared while in peace and prosperity; and which is therefore entitled to his sympathy and assistance in the day of its distress; that cowardly, ungrateful man, SINS AGAINST GOD AND HIS COUNTRY, AND DESERVES THE CURSE OF BOTH. Such a conduct in such a conjuncture, is a moral evil, a gross wickedness; and exposes the wretch to the heavy curse of God, both in this and the eternal world. * * * Oh! for the all-prevailing force of Demosthenes' oratory—but I recall my wish that I may correct it. Oh! for the influence of the Lord of armies, the God of battles, the Author of true courage, and every heroic virtue, to fire you into patriots and soldiers this moment! * * * Ye that love your country, ENLIST, for honor will follow in life or death in such a cause. * * * I seriously make the proposal to you, not only as a subject of the best of kings, and a friend to your country, but as a servant of the Most High God; for I am fully persuaded what I am recommending is His will, and disobedience to it may expose you to His curse." On a day of Fasting and Prayer, during the continuance of the war, he said in his sermon: "If God governs the world by means of second causes, it is our duty, according to our characters, to use all proper means to defend our country, and stop the encroachments of our enemies. * * * Let us use our influence to diffuse a military spirit around us. I have no scruple thus openly to declare, that such of you whose circumstances allow of it, may not only lawfully enlist and take up arms, but that your doing so is a Christian duty, and acting an honorable part, worthy of a man, a freeman, a Briton, and a Christian." On a subsequent occasion, after victories in the war, in a discourse entitled, "A Thanksgiving Sermon for National Blessings," he says: "Providence has surprised us in one week with so many and such important turns in our favor, that loyalty, religion, and all the virtues of patriotism and Christianity united require us to take grateful notice of them. Therefore, I beg an hour of your sacred time for this purpose." After mentioning several victories by name, he proceeds: "Before the hour of victory, destined by heaven, all our attempts were in vain, and issued in inglorious defeats; but when that hour is come, the terror of the Lord falls upon our enemies, and the important acquisitions are made as without hands. The sword of the Lord and of General Amherst, gleaming from afar, strike our enemies into a panic. * * * We may naturally indulge ourselves in all natural decent expressions of joy. We may keep this day as the Jews did the days of Purim, as a day of gladness and joy, of feasting, and sending portions one to another, and

gifts to the poor. (Esther, ix : 19-22.) * * * Let us talk over the goodness of God to our king and country; let our hearts and voices concur in his praise. Praise Him for all our successes, as their original Author."—*Life and Sermons, Vol. III.*

Thus spake Samuel Davies, from the pulpit, when his country was involved in war. We have given these extracts at some length because of the high esteem in which he has always been held as an orthodox, able and successful preacher of the Gospel. It would be in vain at this day to attempt his praise. It would be infinitely worse than in vain to say anything to his disparagement. His position has long since been immovably fixed by the unanimous judgment of the church. What, then, indeed, is really to be thought of such preaching from one of the most eminent orators that ever entered a pulpit?—a man under whose preaching Patrick Henry sat, "from his eleventh to his twenty-seventh year," and whose sermons "produced effects as powerful as those ascribed to Demosthenes," and who "first kindled the fire and afforded the model of Henry's elocution?" How shall we view this at the present day? Did Davies know what belonged to the true province of the pulpit? Who shall venture to instruct him, or who has the hardihood to become his detractor? But can any possible comparison be made between the importance of the French and Indian war then progressing, and that now threatening the destruction of the Nation? Who is so demented as to attempt it? The practical lesson which the bare asking of such questions teaches is too plain to be stated. And yet, tried by the principle laid down by some modern notions, Samuel Davies, in these sermons, would be charged with having profaned the sanctuary; and these utterances, in the elegant language of some declaimers, would be taken as evidence of "theological blood-thirst!"

And thus have spoken many of the great men of Christ's church, in various periods and countries, compared with whom none have surpassed and few have equalled them, for all that adorns the ministerial profession. They may safely be followed. They sustain and illustrate, by their pulpit ministrations, our main proposition. And now we repeat—that while

it is fully sustained by the Holy Scriptures, in their general principles and in their special teachings, upon all the subjects involved; while it is set forth in the Creeds and Confessions of the Evangelical Church Catholic, in all ages; while it is exemplified by special application to particular cases in many extended Acts and elaborate Deliverances of the Church, upon a variety of subjects, called for by immediate emergencies; and while it has been eloquently illustrated and enforced in the Pulpit of the Living Ministry of former times, who have had no superiors in the profession: on the other hand, we boldly affirm, and challenge the disproof of it, that the negative of this proposition is not sustained by any clear teachings of Holy Writ, in terms, principle, or by any fair deduction; nor by any evangelical creeds or explicit church action of former times; nor by any prominent names in the ministry of any evangelical denomination.

If, then, all this be so, why are we seriously advocating such a well-sustained proposition? It is because the times are sadly out of joint. In our day, during these recent years, men have risen up in the church—some of them, hitherto, of great influence—who declaim against this doctrine. They would bind the spouse of Christ with the green withes of their sophistry, so that she may not strike down with her Heaven-girded power the idols of the Philistines which they worship. Behind the barricade which they have erected, they would fortify the position that the pulpit and church courts must be mute, while leading men in the ministry of the church, and thousands of less note in her membership, led astray by their example, plot treason against the lawful government which protects them, and rise in armed rebellion for its overthrow. And some of these men—ministers and elders in the Presbyterian Church—are leaders in the movement, civil and military, and urge on this diabolical work with all their power. This is the specially painful view of the case, that prominent men in the church—men who have for a few years past, in our highest judicatory, loudly declaimed against the ministry and church courts for meddling with what they misname “politics”—all at once, by a sudden transformation, when their schemes are being frustrated, become the most violent preachers of poli-

tics, *pure and simple*, counsel from the pulpit open resistance to the National Government, and throw all the power of their official character and station in aid of the rebellion!

In this state of the case—when so many in the church have been led away by these high examples, and others are in danger—the pulpit would be recreant to its duty, and the church would deserve the curse of Heaven, did she not, through her ministry and courts, cry aloud and spare not, lift up her voice like a trumpet, and show the Lord's people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins, in this attempt against good and lawful government. The pulpit of this day should emulate the pulpit of former times in every country where Presbyterianism has had a name, just to the extent and degree that there may be just occasion for it, in any place, or in any branch of the church. And church courts should follow the noble example set them by the Church of Scotland, and by our own church in days gone by; while enjoining upon all, obedience to the lawful government as a religious duty, and denouncing treason and rebellion as sins against God and man, vindicating at the same time the rights of the pulpit, bringing traitors to justice, and visiting upon them deposition and excommunication. When her tribunals shall do this, the church will deserve the respect of men and enjoy the approbation of God. The pulpit, in these times of peril, need not shun the fiery eloquence of Davies. If his commission was not sullied by his thrilling appeals for loyalty to the government, and for support to its military arm, the commission of no man need be. It should ring out with the clarion notes of Stiles, and Langdon, and Chauncey, and Mayhew, and a host of their coadjutors. It may imitate the boldness of Knox, and Davidson, and the Melvilles. The small men of the present day need not fear to follow where these intellectual and theological giants have led the way. The path which they have trodden, is one of honor, of piety, of duty, and of safety. But how is it with the men of these times? Ministers even in the loyal states, some of them occupying prominent pulpits in our largest cities, when they find it not safe openly to advocate secession, treason, and rebellion, will palliate, extenuate, and excuse them; while others, apparently not daring to go quite so far, will declaim against the horrors of fratricidal

war—and they are terrible enough, as we all too well and painfully know—and will define their own positions in subtle and abstract phrases of convenient construction, and studiously avoid even to pray for the success of the government in putting down rebellion, but will so mince their prayers that they embrace its foes as well; and while still another class, fall back upon and bring out all their logic and lore in an attempt to maintain the position, that this is a subject which the pulpit and church courts must not touch, that it is beyond the province of their proper functions—a proposition which has no solid basis or countenance from truth, human or divine, and which is utterly abhorrent to the readiest and best instincts of the human soul. What! Must society be heaved to its utmost depths, and every interest affecting church and state be imperiled, relating to our moral, social, and religious, as well as our civil welfare, in a country such as ours, and with such a government as ours, a government of *the people*; and must this terrific struggle for and against our NATIONAL LIFE, fill the anxieties of the day and the visions of the night of men of all classes, calling our young men to the battle-field from their workshops and plows, their professions and counting-rooms, from the halls of our colleges and the communion table of our churches; and yet, when all are so enlisted to save the heritage of freedom and self-government which has come down to us from our fathers through a fiery ordeal and a baptism of blood, and when the nations of the whole world and the church of all lands are watching the scene with an interest never before awakened in any cause since nations arose or the church was founded,—must the CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD in this very land, her pulpits and her courts, be the *only place* and they the *only people* on all the broad earth, where men are idle spectators—reverend and grave, sanctimonious and dumb!

Thanks be to kind Heaven, we do not so read her charter, either in the records of God's truth or in the light of her own history. But we say fearlessly, it were better that God should sweep her with the fires of persecution—aye, with the besom of destruction—and raise up a generation that would read and expound his word aright, and teach men their civil, social, and religious duties, as he has solemnly bidden them, than that those engaged in treason, rebellion, and schism, should obtain

"aid and comfort" from even the silence of the church, in the face of the plainest demands of God's word and providence, in this most wicked and causeless attempt to overthrow good government which has ever been made since the rebellion of "the angels which kept not their first estate."

ART. V.—*Credibility of the Resurrection of the Dead.*

THE Bible affirms—does reason corroborate?—that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible,"—that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust,"—that "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth." "No," says an objector, "Reason does not corroborate, but controverts it, and challenges it as *incredible*." And, from the age of the apostles till now, sceptics have not failed to reiterate this Saduceean charge of incredibility against this fundamental doctrine of the Christian system; and even among those who profess to recognize the Bible as God's Word, in a general sense, are found some of the most zealous antagonists to the truth of this doctrine. The plain asseverations of the Bible are not sufficient to convince; and hence they are either explained away, or directly contradicted.

Reason here is supreme; God's Word is constrained to succumb—for it is assumed that the one stands opposed to the other. But is it so? Is our faith in the destined resurrection of the dead founded exclusively in the arbitrary declarations of the Bible? Must we cease to be rational while we exercise credence in this article of our religious faith? We accept the appeal to the designated tribunal of reason. And we are happy to feel assured that no true doctrine of Divine Revelation can suffer by being carried up to this tribunal. God has endowed us, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, with certain rational faculties, by which we are capacitated to entertain the momentous problem, "What is truth?" and to acquire such solutions of it as suffice for all important practical uses,

if they do not put us in actual possession of absolute science. And *that* God who has thus benevolently endowed us is the Author of all truth, whether natural or supernatural—whether in the Bible, or in creation: and truth is ever consistent with the character of its Author, and hence, necessarily also, always consistent with itself, wherever it may be found, or by whatever means it may be made manifest. Therefore, truth in God's Word will be truth in God's works, and before the eyes of universal reason, whether of God, angels, or men.

Let reason, then—not ignorant, benighted, prejudiced, blind reason—but enlightened, candid, honest, thoughtful, pious reason, for the time being, sit in judgment upon the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and award its final decision according to the principles of evidence and its own divine constitution. But let it be distinctly understood, in the outset, that the question which reason is now to consider and dispose of by its rational investigation, is not whether the light of nature, independently of revelation, would suffice to make known to us, and prove this wonderful and mysterious doctrine of the Christian's creed; or whether, after it has been communicated through the medium of God's Word, we can dispense with all aid derived from this source, and upon mere principles of philosophy, in the interpretation of facts and phenomena observable in nature, assure ourselves that this doctrine is not a doctrine of revealed religion only, but of natural religion also. But the question is this—the same which the Apostle Paul addressed to the rational consideration of the skeptics of his day: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" It is simply a question of the credibility or incredibility of a doctrine, for the knowledge of which we are exclusively indebted to divine teaching. The Word of God affirms this doctrine, clearly, unequivocally; the Christian Church has incorporated it in the cardinal articles of her faith, and millions of Christians rejoice in the full persuasion of its truth; but notwithstanding all this, is the doctrine false, and the faith exercised in it a delusion? What are the grounds upon which infidel reason assumes to predicate of the Resurrection of the Dead that it is incredible—beyond the sphere of legitimate

human belief? Let us endeavor to ascertain these grounds, and at the same time test their merits.

I. Is this doctrine incredible because of God's want of power to accomplish the event concerned?

Is not God omnipotent? Is there any limit to his power, save that which his own perfections establish, which render him incapable of doing anything that may conflict with his wisdom, justice, holiness, goodness, and truth? Has he not equal power to raise the body from its dead, decaying, and even long-dissolved condition, as he had to produce it originally from nonentity? Is it any more inconsistent with reason to affirm that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," than it is to affirm that in the beginning God made man, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul? that at a certain period in the evolutions of eternity the human race, which had no antecedent existence whatever, were ushered into being, and endowed with immortality? Does not the fact of man's present existence, as consisting of body and soul intimately united, and mutually dependent and co-operating, furnish a fact as incredible in its intrinsic, essential nature—a fact as wonderful, and mysterious, and incomprehensible to human intellect, and as far removed from the reach of its adequate conception as the fact that God shall raise the dead? Shall we, for a moment, harbor the suspicion that he, by whom all worlds consist—by whom the earth on which we tread, and whose atmosphere we breathe; from whose gurgling fountains we allay our thirst, and by whose bounteous fruits, furnished us in such varied forms, and in such luxuriant harvests, we are nourished; whose every mountain, hill, and valley; whose every ocean, lake, and river; whose every bird, beast, fish, and insect; whose every tree, shrub, and blade of grass; whose every pebble upon the seashore, and radiant flower upon the plain; all attest Divine omnipotence;—shall we, for a moment, harbor the suspicion that the power of God is insufficient to achieve the resurrection of the dead? We can not; we dare not.

Therefore, the charge of incredibility against this doctrine is invalid, upon the ground of the want of Divine power.

II. Is this doctrine incredible, because of the difficulty or

impracticability of the mind's comprehending the manner in which the event taught by it shall be accomplished?

We hear an objector say, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" And as the *how* precisely is not fully revealed or made intelligible to him, he chooses to reject the whole as essentially chimerical. How does Paul respond to such an objector? "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare (or mere) grain; it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." As much as to say, here is a fact you can not deny, and a mystery you can not comprehend, analogous to the resurrection of the dead; will you—can you, in the face of your familiar observation to the contrary, pronounce it—in the advance of the result—incredible that the seed which is planted in the earth, shall, after a species of death and corruption, put forth and produce a body which God will give it—its own body; that it shall issue from its place of burial to a new and higher life than that which it sustained before, and so as that the body produced from it can be traced back to the body from which it sprung in such a way as to constitute a vegetable identity between them? Can you solve this familiar mystery in the vegetable kingdom? Can you comprehend it, and denude it of its inherent mystery? You can not. Divine power is here, and nothing less. Man may sow the seed, but man can not give it growth. It is God that accomplishes this result, and certainly the accomplished fact is proof of the accomplishing ability, although no formula of science may enable us to penetrate the arcana of the fact, or grasp of intellect sufficient to seize all its inexplicable phenomena.

But what event in nature would not be incredible—absolutely incredible—if the only condition upon which it could be believed were that it should first be reduced to the level of the comprehension of the human understanding? On such terms we could not credit our own existence. Therefore, to affirm that, on this account, the resurrection of the dead is incredible, is to affirm that in our disposal of this doctrine we should contravene all the laws of ordinary human belief, and belie the constitution of our mental and moral nature; and

hence, the mere incomprehensibility of the event concerned does not justify the charge of incredibility against it.

III. Is this doctrine incredible, because of the essential antagonism between matter and spirit; matter being essentially and eternally evil, and spirit being a divine emanation, whose destiny is to be delivered from all alliance with matter, and restored to the Divine Essence to be reabsorbed in the great ocean of his infinite Self-existence forever?

To develop and explain this ground of the assumed incredibility would require us to enter into what would be rather an uninteresting and unprofitable, though curious detail of the cosmogony of the ancient Oriental and Grecian philosophers, who maintained that there were "universally two eternal, original principles, God and self-existent matter, neither of which is the foundation of the other. The former they supposed to be a rational and thinking principle, and the author of all good; the other, irrational and unintelligent, and the author of all evil." This theory, in its application to the origin of the world and of man's compound being, invaded the church at a very early day, and is still believed, in the name of Christ, by some of those who profess to be his disciples, and who, by a forced and ingenious exegesis of God's Word, reject its literal and common sense import, and accommodate its teachings to their preconceived and peculiar opinions.

The palpable absurdity of this theory of Oriental schools is a sufficient rejoinder to the charge of incredibility against the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead on this account.

IV. Is this doctrine incredible, because of contradictory events which it involves, like that of causing to be and not to be at the same time?

This, we presume, is the special and main ground upon which it is predicated that no evidence can suffice to make it reasonable to credit the rising of the dead. It is said that the future resurrection of the *same* bodies is "Intrinsically inconceivable and incredible." Mark the expression, "*the same bodies.*" The author of this declaration (Bush) inculcates the doctrine of a resurrection *from* the dead—not *of* the dead—by the elimination of a spiritual body from the material body in the event of death; and this, he maintains, by a

most specious, but arbitrary and constrained system of argumentation, to be the doctrine of God's Word upon this subject.

You perceive that the point of difficulty does not consist in the simple resurrection of the bodies, but of the *same* bodies. "With what body do they come?" asks the objector; indicating by his interrogatory, that it certainly can not be with the same bodies. Thus he settles down in the persuasion that it is demonstrated, by the very nature of the case, that the resurrection of the dead "is inconceivable and incredible."

But we rejoin: That is the very thing to be proven, and not taken for granted. The question is, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"—not separate a living principle *from* the dead, but *raise the dead*. And what is it of man that dies? Not the soul or spirit, but the body. And if "the *dead* shall be raised incorruptible," as is affirmed in the Word of God, and the *bodies* of men only die, should we not understand God's Word as affirming that the *dead bodies* of men shall be the subject of a resurrection?

But these bodies, immediately subsequent to death, undergo decomposition—"the dust returns to the earth as it was"—and their elements enter into other organic or inorganic alliances—it may be, to some extent, become constituent parts of other living bodies; and it is not absurd to presume that the material elements, which entered into the organization of the bodies of the first men who fell victims of mortality thousands of years ago, have sustained organic connection, as constituent elements, with thousands of other human bodies since their day.

How, therefore, it is asked, can the same bodies ever be raised from the dead? To suppose such an event possible is to suppose that bodies *can be* and *not be* possessed of the same constituent elements at one and the same time, which is a palpable contradiction, and therefore beyond even Divine power to effect. The conclusion deduced follows infallibly from the premises laid down, that the resurrection of the dead is clearly impossible, and the objector seems, at last, to have demonstrated his charge of incredibility.

But the premises—are they correct? Sound logic can reach

false conclusions only from false premises. Whether these are true or false, therefore, it is all-important to ascertain before we proceed to build an argument upon them, and to deduce our corollaries. All our reasoning, however well-sustained and beautifully concatenated, must be utterly abortive in the search of truth or exposure of error, if it sets out with a false major proposition.

We deny the correctness of the premises assumed, and hence we regard the conclusion as invalidated by this fact. It is not essential to the resurrection of the dead bodies, that the risen bodies should be constituted of precisely the same material elements with the mortal bodies which they represent, in order that we may be justified in believing the scripture doctrine of the resurrection. It is *his own body* which God promises to confer upon every soul of man, in the event of the resurrection—*his own body* in distinction from *the body of another*; and in this *propriatorship*—whatever may be the essence of it—consists the peculiar relationship between the mortal and immortal bodies—the bodies dead and the bodies risen. And this proprietorship is a felt-proprietorship inhering in the consciousness of each individual soul of man, so that, as in the present life, through the successive periods of it, man is always assured that he is possessed of his own body in distinction from that of another, it shall be also his own body which the resurrection will rescue from the state of the dead, as the future immortal organism of his immortal soul. It will therefore be a sameness or identity of proprietorship; and this sameness or identity, consciously perpetuated through continued changes and periods of time, does not consist in the sameness or identity of the inert, passive materials of the body, but in the living, active principle of the body, the soul. The man-proper is not the body, but the soul, for man was not man till he received the breath of life, and then, it is written, "man became a living soul."

Upon this principle, no contradiction is involved in the event of the resurrection of the dead, any more than in the actual continuing of the existence of the same body from one moment to another on earth, in midst of the incessant flux and reflux of material particles which enter into and pass away from its ever-changing constituency. The sameness—the

identity—is in the soul—is a personal identity, a *felt personal identity*, which pervades the whole compound being of man in his compound state, whether antecedent to death or subsequent to the resurrection.

V. But whether we shall regard it as credible or incredible that God should raise the dead, is so dependent upon the particular conception we may form of the nature of the *sameness* or *identity* in question, that our chief attention, in this discussion, will be devoted to an attempt to develop and elucidate the true idea of the identity involved. It is a subject of acknowledged difficulty, and one which it was well worthy of the cultivated analytical powers of the great Butler to reduce from incomprehensible mystery to the light of intelligibility. Mystery still cleaves to it, however, and always must, just as essential mystery envelops and pervades every work of the Glorious Deity. But its mystery is not such as to justify us in rejecting its truth, or in failing to apprehend it as truth, by the understanding.

That a recognized relationship is destined to subsist between the dead and the raised bodies, sufficient to justify the predication of a species of sameness or identity between them, is an inevitable inference from the language employed by the Scriptures in the presentation of this subject. But observe, we say a *species* of sameness or identity. Now, the question is, what is that species? In what does its specific nature consist? How may it be clearly and satisfactorily defined and explained? To solve this problem is the task we are now about to undertake. And as preparatory to this solution, we will first consider in what senses the dead and the raised bodies are not the same, or wherein their identity does not consist.

1. Their sameness or identity *does not consist* in their being distinguished by the same peculiar attributes; for in this respect they are not identical, but are as variant from each other as light from darkness, life from death; or rather, we should say, as glory from vileness, power from weakness, incorruption from corruptibility, immortality from mortality. Yes, the risen body—especially of such as have part in the first resurrection—is essentially different from and superior to the dead body in its peculiar properties.

Thus God's Word teaches. Paul, in his epistle to the Phil-

ippians (iii: 20, 21), speaking of the present life and future destination of Christians, says, "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." The second coming of the Lord is here referred to by the apostle, in which event the resurrection of the dead will be effected; and then it is that these our now vile bodies shall be *changed*—shall be purified from all their vileness, and shall be made glorious after the manner of Christ's glorious body.

Again, says the apostle in his epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv: 43, 44), "It—that is, the dead body—is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Further, he says (same chap., 52, 53), "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, * * * for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Thus while revelation carefully retains the idea of an identity subsisting between the dead and the risen bodies, it likewise, with equal care, assures us that this identity does not consist in an identity of attributes. The object of our search, therefore, must be sought elsewhere, for we have not found, and can not find it here.

2. Still further, their identity *does not consist* in their being constituted of the same identical particles of matter. How abundantly this is both proven and illustrated by the consciousness of every living man in his present body! It is a matter of fact too well ascertained to be denied, that our bodies, while performing the ordinary functions of life, are continually undergoing changes in their material consistency—that really no two successive moments find this constituency precisely the same. In every inhalation of the lungs, in the common act of breathing, we receive material elements into union with our physical organisms, so that these elements become constituent parts of said organisms, and contribute to nourish and sustain them; and at the same time, we give out or exhale into the air, material particles which had sustained a

living union with our bodies up to this moment, but now are returned to the great reservoir of nature to fulfill another mission there. Food and drink taken into the body, in answer to the imperious demands of hunger and thirst, are assimilated, by a most wonderful and benevolent process, to all the varied and complex organs and tissues of our most fearfully and wonderfully made bodies, so as promptly to supply the place of effete particles carried away, and thus keep up the integrity of every bone, and muscle, and nerve, and sinew, and membrane, as long as a healthy life is sustained.

There is an incessant pulling down and building up of our physical systems—a transferring of material elements, some being removed and others being substituted in their stead—a constant *resurrection from the dead, and of the dead*, as it were, exemplified in our daily experience. There is no fact in nature with which we are more conversant than this. We are living and dying, dying and living at every breath. We are passing from old to new bodies every instant of time.

And yet there is a felt identity between the old and the new body—between the body of the moment before and that of the moment after—yea, between the body of the child, which has not yet encountered the vicissitudes of this life for a single hour, and the body of the frail, trembling, paralytic patriarch, eighty years afterward, bending into the grave. But certainly, it is not an identity of material elements, nor an identity growing out of, or resulting from, matter at all in any of the peculiar arrangements it may assume as the temporary tabernacle of the soul.

3. We go further, and say that there is reason to presume that the material constituency of the raised body must vary from that of the dead or mortal body; else the change of attributes by which the former is distinguished from the latter would be impracticable without a change in the essential properties of matter.

The whole number of material elements supposed to enter into the constitution of the human body has been estimated at about sixteen. This is the maximum estimate. Chemists have hitherto been able to detect but sixty-six primary elements in all nature, and comparatively few of these are the basis of all nature's phenomena. Into the human body these

elements are received chiefly as proximate elements—that is, as elements in composition.

But material elements have certain invariable properties by which they are distinguished, and when certain known elements enter into certain known combinations, whether by the chemistry of mere elective affinities, or by that chemistry which inheres in the mysterious principle called *vital force*, their properties, or, in other words, their phenomena will be invariable. Therefore, if the constituency of the risen body is to be precisely the same, in its elemental structure, with the present mortal body, it can not, without the annulling of some, at least, of the essential properties of matter, possess any attributes different from those of its former state. The very conclusion that the risen body is not a vile, weak, corruptible, mortal body, but a glorious, powerful, incorruptible, immortal body, involves the necessity of a change in its material constituency.

Hence, if it is asked, In what does the identity subsisting between the dead and the risen bodies consist? we answer, *first*, not in their being possessed of the same distinguishing properties; and *second*, not in their being constituted of the same material elements.

4. In what, then, does this identity consist—not negatively, but affirmatively? Can we tell? Perhaps it may be denied that there is any such thing as identity predicable of man in the different periods of his earthly history. If so, our consciousness will belie the denial. We feel—we know that we are the same through all the vicissitudes of this life, and through all periods of it. We may not be able to furnish any philosophical explanation of it, but the fact is a fact of experience, and this suffices to assure us that it is a fact, whether we can explain it or not. It is testified to by the instinctive, involuntary consciousness of our being, and no sane man will refuse to trust in the evidence of his consciousness.

But this identity is not felt by us to consist in a particular identity of material constituency and organization of the body, through all the periods of its waste and repair, its growth and decline. Indeed, according to our consciousness, it does not *inhere* at all in the body as a whole, nor in its parts; and yet

it does in some way still attach to the body. But not to the body as composed of certain material elements to the exclusion of others, and as having certain proportions and harmonies of form, and certain temperaments, and susceptibilities and powers in distinction from others, but to the body simply and wholly as *our own body and not the body of another*.

This, therefore, we infer, is the essence of bodily identity. It is an identity resulting from the soul proprietorship; and the voice of consciousness which attests its existence, is the voice, not of the body in whole or in part, but of the proper person of man, the soul—the living, thinking, reasoning and conscious principle within—saying through all periods and conditions of the compound being of said person, whether before or after the resurrection: this body is my own true, proper body—a part of my compound self; for God gives to every soul, as to every seed, his own body.

This is the only identity which can be truly predicated of the continued relationship of the human body to itself through the different periods of its mortal life—an identity subsisting really in the soul, and predicable of the body only in so far as it is the soul's own body, and not the body of another. And this identity will reach beyond the grave, and extend throughout eternity as easily and as certainly as from one moment to another in time.

VI. Let analogies come to our aid for argument and illustration. Paul has given us an example of an analogy, to which we have already referred, and which he employed with skill and force in reply to a certain objector, who said, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" "Thou fool," said Paul, "that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." In commenting on this passage, Dr. Candlish remarks, in his *Life in a Risen Saviour*: "You sow the seed with a view to its being quickened and living. But you sow it in the full knowledge that it can be quickened and can live, only by its undergoing a process of death, decay and dissolution. That

is the condition of its being quickened and living. And the process which it must undergo is such as to change its whole nature and character; and so to change it, that what springs up is something altogether new—"thou sowest not that body that shall be." What you sow is 'bare grain;' it is 'the mere seed of wheat, or some other kind of corn.' What comes up has a very different material or corporeal structure and organization from that which the 'bare grain' you sow possesses. What sort of body it is that is to come up depends on the sovereign will of the great Husbandman. 'God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.' But whatever change there may be, identity is not, in any wise, to be lost; for there is to 'every seed his own body.'"

And in immediate connection with this analogy from the natural world, Paul employs several others, all contributing to the same result—to show that it is not incredible that God should raise the dead, and that the connection, involving identity, which the common faith of Christians accept as destined to subsist between the dead and the risen bodies, is a connection the bonds of which are in the life or soul by which these bodies respectively are animated, and not in the inert, unconscious matter which may at any time sustain an organic union with said life or soul. And what is there in this that is "intrinsically inconceivable and incredible?" What is there in this that does not accord with the lifetime experience and intuitive convictions of every intelligent creature?

VII. But we propose another analogy, after the manner of Paul, for argument and illustration, derived from the vegetable kingdom.

1. Suppose we have an acorn in our hand. It is the seed of an oak. But how different in aspect from the parent tree! Who would ever suspect, from any visible indications, that there was any relationship between them! They sustain not the slightest apparent similitudes to each other, and yet their internal nature is the same. The oak is in the tree, and in the acorn alike; but the tree is not an acorn, nor the acorn a tree. But both are visible and peculiar manifestations of the oak. What a mystery, and what a power are confined—shut up within the pale of the narrow cup of the one; and what a no greater mystery and power are developed through the

huge trunk, and gnarled branches, and rich sinuate foliage of the other!

"The pulpy acorn, ere it swells, contains
The oak's vast branches in its milky veins,
Each ravell'd bud, fine film and fibre line
Trac'd with nice pencil, in its small design."

We contemplate the acorn. It is a living, vegetable existence, and that living vegetable existence is *an oak*. The vital force—the mysterious, incomprehensible, vital force present in the acorn, and which endows it as a living seed, is the same vital force which subsequently pervades the tree that proceeds from it, and which endows it, not as a living tree only, but as a living *oak* tree. But in what does this vital force consist? Can we dissect or analyze it? Can we subject it to experimental observation by the aid of the microscope, or trace out its occult elements by any means within our power? We can not. It is a hidden, mysterious, wonder-working power, of the effects of which alone we are privileged to become cognizant. Itself evades our most searching scrutiny.

2. We take the acorn and plant it in the earth, in suitable conditions for vegetation and growth. If the vital force be not present in the seed, the acorn will very soon be dissolved and entirely disappear without any vegetable or organized product whatever resulting from it. But upon the supposition that it is a living acorn—that the vitality of the oak pervades it, we will soon discover that the homogeneous mass of the seed is assuming a new aspect—that the material elements are assuming new arrangements, and a plant is developed. The *radicle* sends forth its little branches to seize upon the soil, and the *plume* looks upward to the air and the sun. The seed has been absorbed as nourishment by the embryo, and having fulfilled its peculiar mission, is not perpetuated. Now instead of the acorn, we have the infant tree in the form of a little plant, and that plant is an oak-plant; and it is an oak-plant, not by virtue of the mere relations and properties of the material elements which enter into its organic structure and form, but by virtue of the *oak-life* which pervades it, and in which the organic potency of its being subsists. Soon the plant becomes a shrub, the tree in its childhood, and that shrub is an oak-shrub, for the same oak-life which pervaded the smaller

growth of the plant, pervades the larger development of the shrub. But from the earth and the air, through the instrumentality of its roots and its leaves, it receives new accessions of material constituents continually to its vegetable organic structure, and increases daily in magnitude, until, in the progress of centuries, it becomes the monarch of the woods. But at no point of time in all this progressive development, from its first germination up to its now majestic proportions, running through a period of hundreds of years, has it ever ceased to be the same identical oak, of which the seed, the plant, the shrub, and the tree, are but the body in various stages of development. And in the meanwhile what a flux and reflux of material constituency have transpired in the structure and composition of this body of the oak! Through no two successive moments of all this extent of time of the oak's existence and development, have the material particles in union with its organic body been precisely the same. And yet the identity of the oak remains inviolate, in the midst of all these material changes—this incessant waste and repair of its material embodiment. We contemplate the tree, now towering high in the might of its majesty, and suppose we are familiar with its history. Five hundred years ago, we say, a certain man planted this tree. In common language we say, he planted *the tree*; but literally, he did not plant the tree, but the *acorn*, and the tree was long subsequent to the planting. More accurately speaking, he planted the *oak*, then an acorn, now a tree; and the oak, subsisting in and manifested through this tree, is the *same identical oak*, which was planted nearly half a millennium since. To maintain that the identity here acknowledged is dependent on and the result of the continuity of the same material elements as entering into the same material organs and organization, and as performing the same physical or vegetable functions, is at variance with common understanding. There is no such identity nor can there be. And yet we are sure there is what we recognize as an identity. But it is an identity more grand and sublime than that which is the result of mere material organism—an identity growing out of, and dependent on, the continuity of the same vital force—the *oak-life*—which is the efficient *created cause*, subordinate to the primary *creative cause*, of all the various material

modifications and arrangements, which constitute its organic body. The incipient germination, and all the subsequent growth, have been effected by no mere potency of matter, but by that peculiar, mysterious, inexplicable vegetable life, which constitutes the *oak proper*, in distinction from its material body, the *tree*; so that we can say, with propriety, the tree is but the creature of the oak-life. That is, the vital force is the energizing power which is the immediate efficient cause of the tree, and develops its roots, trunk, branches, foliage, and fruit, and impresses upon it its laws, its phenomena, and its destiny. The tree, therefore, is a development of the life within it, and the life not a development of the tree. Hence it is possible that the life may subsist independently of the tree which it develops, for the cause is always before the effect; the oak-life precedes, in the order of being, the oak-tree, which is the creature of the oak-life. It may be said that a cause can not be a cause, except as productive of an effect—that cause and effect are correlative terms, the one always supposing the other, and therefore that there can be no cause as antecedent to its effect, because separate from an effect it is no cause. This is logically true. But there may be a causal power without a caused effect. The causal power may be latent, for want of the conditions requisite to render it operative; and it is no less really a power on this account. Let the requisite conditions transpire, and the power, drawn forth from its latency, ceases to be merely *causal*, and becomes a *cause* by the production of its appropriate effect. In this case, the causal power is an antecedent principle; the caused effect, a subsequent result. So the life principle in vegetable and in animal organisms, is a *cause* of which the organisms respectively through which it manifests itself, are an *effect*; but this life-principle may, possibly, exist as a *causal power* without the effect which, under certain conditions, it is capable of producing. And if so, is it not possible also that the effect may be destroyed, and the causal power survive the destruction of the effect? And if this power may survive such an event, may it not again, on some future occasion, renew its legitimate effect, and become a cause? The effect is but a contingency, dependent on the cause. Now, for sake of perfecting the analogy, let us suppose the oak-life to be immortal; and this

supposition is not absurd, nor intrinsically inconceivable. It is assumed, therefore, that the oak-life, or soul-principle of the oak-tree, ever lives whatever may befall its bodily organism, the tree. We believe, for the present, the soul-life of the tree to be immortal; just as we are assured the soul-life of the human body is immortal. But notwithstanding such is our faith upon this subject, we see the tree sicken and die, and eventually become uprooted and dissolved, or that not a trace of it is left behind to attest that it ever had an existence. What now becomes of our immortality doctrine? The tree is dead and wasted away, and where is it? Nowhere. But the tree's life-principle—where is it? If that is immortal, it still lives, though not in its material body as heretofore. And it lives, not as a mere principle of life irrespective of its nature, but as oak-life, in distinction from other species of life in the vegetable world, and as its own individual oak-life in distinction from every other life of the same order.

And is it not conceivable, and might it not be credible that this oak-life, in its immortality, might possibly resume its material manifestation in its own oak-body, now dead and decomposed, but then correctly represented as raised from the dead? Let that life be commissioned, as in the acorn, to exercise the prerogative, under Divine appointment, of taking for itself a body—of which it may have been divested for thousands of years—out of the material world, and is it incredible that it can be done? And if this be admitted to be possible, are we obligated to maintain that the resumption of the raised body must be effected first in the form of an acorn; then of a little plant; then of a shrub, and then, after a long period, of a giant tree! And also, must we believe that every particle of the material elements that had ever before entered the organized constituency of the old and dead tree, must find its place in the constituency of the new and risen tree? Neither of these conditions are indispensable. And the tree, thus reassumed by its own oak-life—thus raised from the state of death and dissolution—would infallibly be an *oak-tree*, and not an ash, nor a beech, nor a sycamore—would be the oak's *own true body*, once dead and reduced to an elemental state, now reorganized and made alive by its own *true oak-life*, and henceforth the oak-life and the oak-tree would be one

organic existence, sustaining, through the medium of its life-principle, an identity of being with all the former periods and states of that existence.

3. So man, as a terrestrial animal, is compound in his nature—consists of soul and body. The soul is the tree, self-conscious, active, thinking principle of his nature; the body is the mere material organism of the soul. As long as the soul inhabits the body, so long the body lives, and amid all the physical and constitutional changes of which it may be the subject, never loses its identity as the organism of the same living, indwelling principle. But death comes at length. The soul takes its departure from the body; and as the body exists exclusively for sake of the soul, and by virtue of the soul's vivifying and conserving power, whenever the soul departs, that vital force which had hitherto sustained its vital functions and preserved it from decomposition, is withdrawn, and the body returns to the earth as it was. But the soul does not die. This is immortal. And *this* living, where is the incredibility of the doctrine which teaches that God shall raise the dead?

4. Some seek to relieve this difficulty by looking for the germ of the future body in the dust of the dead body. What ridiculous ideas of this description have been promulged! What is the *germ* of anything but its *life*? Undeveloped life it may be called, but it is no less certainly life. The germ of a plant or an animal is susceptible of being developed with the plant or the animal of which it is the germ, only because the potent life is in the germ. An organic germ is not essential to the subsistence of a life which is immortal in a condition separate from all material organisms, as is the case with the human soul after death. That life *first* subsists, and *then* the germ subsists for the life's sake, while it is no more a part of the life's essence, than is the house which a man inhabits a part of the essence of its inhabitant. The true living germ is not a mere aggregation nor chemical combination of certain material elements sustaining certain peculiar modes and forms of organization, but it is a potent life, which, in dwelling in certain definite forms of matter, develops potentially a continued and growing organization, and other phenomena of organic existence, through the instrumentality and medium of these definite and peculiar forms.

Hence we affirm that the real germ or life of the future risen body is that which is the germ or life of the present body; namely, the soul. The soul, we say, never dies. It goes to God who gave it, and continues with him for a period. But when that period has elapsed, God will restore to every soul its own body; a body, it may be, organized of other and far more glorious elements than those which entered into the constituency of the dead body, for it will be a far more glorious body; a body far more vigorous and untiring in its capabilities, for it is to inhabit a sphere forever, where there is no night, and where they serve God without ceasing; a body far more in harmony with the character and wants, and far more obedient to the behests of its immortal occupant; for in the future state no redeemed sinner will have occasion to lament that he finds a law in his members warring against the law of his mind; a body freed from all that is gross and offensive as pertaining to it in its present mortal state, and from being a mortal or mere animal body, as dependent upon the temporal resources, and subject to the trials and limitations of this life, shall become a spiritual body subsisting upon resources far above and superior to anything of which we are now able to form any adequate, or even approximate, conception; a body formed anew and of elements adapted to its future and more glorious and felicitous destination, and modified in all its functions, and organs, and properties by the *vital force*—the immortal soul—which is to be its eternal occupant, and for whose sake it is reproduced from the state of death and dissolution—the soul's own true body, once dead, but now alive to die no more forever.

5. Grant the immortality of the soul, and there can be no rational difficulty in granting the resurrection of the body. The credibility of such an event, in view of all the ascertained circumstances in which it is proposed to be effected, is no more preposterous than the credibility of the growth of a grain of wheat which has been sown in the earth for this specific purpose; and the difficulties pertaining to the question of identity between the dead and the risen bodies are no more incomprehensible than the same difficulties pertaining to the same question in regard to the living body through any two successive moments of its existence. If the life remains

unimpaired in the grain of wheat, though it may have been latent for three thousand years, while slumbering in an Egyptian catacomb, yet whenever it is placed in favorable conditions, it will vegetate and produce; and that body, which it will produce, will be infallibly *its own body*, and not the body of another, for God gives it a body as it pleases him, and to every seed its own body.

Thus analogous events in nature, familiar to our daily observation, furnish their silent but effective testimony in vindication of the credibility of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and the charge of incredibility against it fails in every particular. God's Word and God's works harmonize with each other; what the one affirms or teaches, the other corroborates and elucidates. And the mysteries of the one are no greater than the mysteries of the other, and of all mysteries, whether of doctrine or fact, God himself is the chief and most incomprehensible. It would, therefore, be supremely absurd on our part, as rational beings, and on distinctively assumed rational grounds, to repudiate—simply because of its mystery—the clearly enunciated doctrine of God's Word, that “there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust;” that “all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth, they that have done good to a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to a resurrection of damnation.”

Let God be true, and every man who contravenes his declarations, a liar. His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. “The dead shall be raised incorruptible.”

VIII. We conclude with some practical observations addressed to the reader.

1. Are you a Christian? If so, in view of your belief in this wonderful and sublime doctrine pertaining to your future destination, how should you be consecrated to the Divine service and glory, by all the capabilities with which, as a compound being, you have been endowed? Can it suffice for you to render to the Lord a mere bodily service, or a mere soul service?—to separate between your soul and body in obeying God's will?—to reserve the one for sensual uses, while the other only is consecrated to Jehovah? No; your obligation is to glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are

God's. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof; neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God;" for the body, as well as the soul, has been redeemed from death by him who is the resurrection and the life. "I beseech you, brethren," says Paul, "by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Observe, it is "present your bodies a *living* sacrifice;" that is, with all their living powers, whether of thought, reason, judgment, imagination, memory, will, art of speech, art of writing, power to execute any purpose or achieve any deed which the soul may will and decree to be executed or achieved through the instrumentality of the members, or muscular powers, of the body which it inhabits and endows as a *living* body.

This is, indeed, your reasonable service; for your bodies and spirits are not your own—they have been bought with a price—they are the Lord's. They are the Lord's by original creation, and they are the Lord's also by the purchase of the Messiah. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, * * but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." And it is by virtue of this redemption, and the grace obtained through it, that Christians, in the immediate prospect of dissolution, are privileged to exclaim, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and again, "Death is swallowed up in victory." Christ died that we might live, and "he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." Yes, *rose again*. Christ "was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." He rose in demonstration of the Divine power to raise the dead, and as an earnest of the fact that the dead shall be raised incorruptible. For you to live, therefore, should be Christ. The life you now live in the flesh, you should live

by the faith of the Son of God, who loved you and gave himself for you: and then for you to die will be gain. While in the mortal body, "we know not what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;" and our vile body shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body.

What manner of persons, therefore, ought you to be, in all holy conversation and godliness, seeing you look for such things! If you are faithful to Him who is the resurrection and the life, and faithful to the interests of your immortal destination, as involving both the corporeal and spiritual elements of your being, then shall you be of the happy and glorious multitude who shall rise in Christ, and as thus restored to the full integrity of your being, you will be exalted at God's right hand where there are pleasures forevermore.

2. Are you an unbeliever? How does the credibility of this doctrine of the resurrection of the dead appeal to you for your consideration? I say *credibility*—not incontrovertible, demonstrated truth—but *mere credibility*. Let it be admitted that it is possibly, and only *possibly* true, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, and is not the unbeliever utterly inexcusable, who refuses or delays to take the subject into immediate and earnest thought and investigation, that he may be assured beyond a reasonable doubt that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is not incredible, before he settles down, contentedly, into the rank of an unbeliever? For if this doctrine be true, it is of infinite moment that he should believe it; and if by reason of indifference, or incorrigible indolence, or mental and moral perversity, he should disbelieve, his error will be a fatal one. There is no doctrine more distinctly enunciated in God's Word, and no doctrine more significant and indispensable in its place, to the completeness of that faith which works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world, than this of the resurrection of the dead. It is even an essential part of the Gospel—the glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yes, and we are

found false witnesses for God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." 1 Cor. xv: 13-15.

And hear, once more, the Saviour's own declaration upon this subject: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice (the voice of the Son of God), and shall come forth, *they that have done good to a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to a resurrection of damnation.*" What a glorious destination for the one! and what a fearful destination for the other! and all depending upon the simple exercise or non-exercise of faith in Christ, and in what he has done and is doing for man's salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

But do you insist upon it that it is incredible that God should raise the dead? Are you resolved, at all hazards, to abide in your unbelief of this doctrine, so fundamental in the Christian's creed, and so essential to the perfection of the Christian's hopes? Or will you accept the truth that as "by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead?" And if so, will you not, at once, come to Christ who has said, "I am the resurrection and the life; whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection"—that is, the resurrection in Christ. Oh, then, while it is called to-day, will you not hear the voice of the Saviour, and not harden your hearts?

3. The period is rapidly approaching to every mortal on earth, whether believer or unbeliever, when he shall be called to contend with his last earthly enemy, the issue of which will be that he will either conquer or be conquered. And none shall conquer who do not conquer in Christ; and none who put their trust in this blessed Saviour will ever be forsaken and left to contend in his own strength, in this the most dread hour of his earthly extremities. And after death comes the judgment, when the believer shall stand forever acquitted, through the righteousness of Christ and sanctification of the Spirit, and shall enter into the joy of the Lord forever.

But how will it fare with the unbeliever in that event?

Where shall the ungodly and sinner appear? How shall he, then and there, answer for the deeds done in the body, without the righteousness of a surety to cover his transgressions? What will be his prospects, in view of the destined resurrection of his body, since that body was the partner of his unbelieving soul in the rejection of the only Name which had ever been given under heaven among men, whereby he could have been saved?

The death-bed and the grave are full of admonition to us all, to work while it is called to-day—to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure, so that when we come to lie upon the one and be buried in the other, we shall rest in the assurance of a future and glorious resurrection. And in times like these, when civil war is rapidly converting our land into an aceldama, and when every household is a household of mourning—when death by disease and death by violence—death in our quiet homes, and death amid the noise, and tumult, and bloodshed of the battle-fields are cutting down the old and the young, the weak and the strong, and all our earthly foundations are trembling with the throes of dissolution beneath us, how important, unspeakably important, to have our peace made with God, and our life bound up in the bundle of life with Christ Jesus, so that whether we live or die, we shall be the Lord's, and with Job may be enabled to say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

ART. V.—*The New Life of the Redeemed.* PART I.

THAT God is himself the chief and ultimate end of all things, is a truth taught in the Holy Scriptures with a clearness and directness of statement, that it is something worse than folly to deny it; and reason, no less than Scripture, affirms that

it is right for God to seek the glory of his own name in all his works and ways; but far the mightiest and most wonderful of all God's strange works, is the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ. It is *the* means, in each and all of its parts and results, whereby he is pleased to glorify himself before the face of the universe. It is the crowning act of infinite power and wisdom and goodness. It is the chief of the ways of God. His stately steppings are seen in the sanctuary as nowhere else. If, then, there are things hard to be understood in the natural creation, and in the ordinary providential dealings of God with our race, what awful and unsearchable mysteries may we expect to find in the plan of redemption! Rationalism is as senseless as it is impious. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness!" It is the mystery of mysteries—a sea of wonders whose depths no human, no angelic line, can sound. It is the divinest of all divine things. It is an infinite conception; in every step of it wrought out by infinite power; in every result of it infinitely wonderful.

The three great parties to be considered in this divine plan of salvation, are God, man, and the Mediator. God is the author, man the subject, and Christ the executive of it. Moreover, as to God he is the last end of it; as to Christ, the end of it is his exaltation to the throne of David and of the universe forever; as to man, the end of it is his everlasting glorification and blessedness in Christ Jesus. The two ends last named are ultimate only so long as we consider the parts and parties of the scheme of grace separately: so soon as we contemplate it in its grand totality, we find them subordinate and subsidiary to the real ultimate and chief end of all, the glory of God. Such is the representation of the Scriptures. At the opening of the Saviour's prayer, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, he thus addresses the Father: "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee;" and in Eph. iii: 8-10, Paul, speaking of his own ministry, says, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all

things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." Glory, and mystery, and unsearchable riches, and the manifold wisdom of God reign throughout the wondrous plan. Glory to God is the chief end—glory through the unsearchable riches, and wisdom, and mystery of it all.

In the person and mediatorial offices of the incarnate Redeemer, in the application of his redemptive work, and in the nature of the New Life imparted thereby to the soul of man, are combined the unsearchable riches of the mystery of redeeming power and love. But these not only stand in the closest and exactest relation to each other, but also follow each other in the order of time and nature as indicated above, and so follow that the last is not simply a sequence, but a consequence, an outgrowth, and hence responsive to the productive forces. The immediate object of the incarnation of the Son of God—the taking of the human into union with the divine—was to impart life to the dead. Now this life, resulting from the union of the soul to Christ by faith, must in its *order*, partake of the nature of that of the Lord of life and glory, who is its author. The condition of its existence and continuance, is union to the son of God by faith in him. He is the head; the church is his body. One life animates the whole. All believers are one in him in virtue of the common life all derive from him; and he and they are one. This life, then, does not bear to its great author, God our Saviour, the simple and single relation of creature to Creator, as the life of plants and animals, or the rational and spiritual life of Adam when first created, or that of holy angels. It is a new creation, indeed, as contrasted with the *old man*; but still it is a life *derived* from Christ, even as the life of sin is derived from Adam. We are "*begotten* again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; * * * being *born* again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." Hence the mystery of the life of the renewed soul, is the adorable mystery of the life of Christ; for it is neither more nor less than the life of Christ in the soul of man. (Gal. ii: 20.) In him are two distinct natures and one *person* forever; and this one living person, the Son of

God incarnate, the God-man, is the primeval source and upholder of life in the once fallen but renewed sons of men. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." He is the second Adam, the Lord from heaven; and as is he that begetteth, so are they that are begotten of him. Their life is of the same order. Herein is found the unity of the mystery of redemption, which begins in the incarnation of the second person of the Godhead and terminates in the glorification of the soul in a perpetual life-union with its mediatorial Head and King, and all to the glory of the divine power, and wisdom, and grace. The mystery of the incarnation passes over in the divine-human life of the redeemed.

The Son of God took into union with himself a true body and a reasonable soul—the man Jesus of Nazareth. But this man never existed as a distinct personality, separate from his union with the Son of God. He never had a life of his own independently of that union, for he never existed but in that ineffable relation, and never will exist otherwise. Our Mediator is neither the Son of God simply, nor the son of man simply; but he is the God-man. So his life is the life not of the Son of God, nor of the son of man, but of the God-man.* We live in virtue of our incorporation with Christ, becoming thereby members of his body. The spiritual life that informs

* When the convicted sinner, enlightened and drawn by the Spirit, turns his eyes to the agonizing sufferer on the cross, he does not coldly inquire, How can the Godhead die? He sees one hanging on a tree, made a curse for him, all human in his sympathies, all divine in his power to save. He does not speculate as to the part the two natures play in the work of atonement. It is *Christ* that dies—that individual person; the innocent for the guilty—his substitute: that is enough for him. Thus we speak of the *life* of Christ. There is no more difficulty in predicating two natures and one life, than two natures and one person. The one life answers to the one person. Look at him as he travels about Galilee, mingling with the people in ordinary intercourse, teaching and working miracles. His is a life perfectly unique, characteristic of him alone. It is distinct from every other order of life. It combines the innocence, gentleness, meekness, affection, dignity, and every other quality of a perfect human nature, with a divine holiness, wisdom, authority, power, goodness, and truth. The beloved disciple, as a familiar friend, leans his head upon the Saviour's bosom, while sacred reverence and awe possess and elevate his soul. "Familiarity operates a kind of apotheosis and the man becomes divinity in simply being known." It is this unique life of Christ, thus manifested to the world which, for want of a better name, we call divine-human.

and impenetrates the rational soul of the redeemed sinner, is the life of the God-man. In this he henceforth lives and moves and has his being. His is no longer simply a rational nature, working according to the primal law of its being, in the way of holiness; but he is filled with the fullness of Christ who is "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." "And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace;" i. e. grace in us answering to grace in him.

In all this, no doubt, there is much transcending our capacity to grasp and explain—much in addition to the thick darkness which veils all life from the gaze of mortals. Known unto God alone are his works. We can know but in part. A great fact is revealed—the incarnation, for instance, or the new life; the rationale of it may be altogether inexplicable to us. The mysteriousness of it, however, so far from constituting a just ground for rejecting it, is a reason for accepting it, provided it be revealed as a fact in Holy Scripture, or is deducible therefrom by good and necessary inference. Our God is a God that doeth wonders; and where shall we look for wonders like those of redeeming grace? that work above all others whereby God is pleased to glorify himself. Let us not, then, turn away from the consideration of this subject, because there may be much in it we can not understand. Perhaps we may discover a great fact revealed, touching the nature of the divine life in the soul of man, that will prove very precious truth in itself, as well as confirmatory and explanatory of other doctrines of divine revelation.

The idea commonly entertained by intelligent Christian people is, that nothing more is involved in the transformation of the soul in redemption than its restoration, when the work of grace and power is completed, to its original sinlessness. This is all, except that it is unchangeably confirmed in holiness; so that henceforth upheld of God, and so upheld that it shall never more fall, it works freely, normally, spontaneously, in the direction of holiness, as it did originally in Adam, and as does the nature of angels who never fell. But is this idea correct? Is this the end of the Divine plan as it terminates on human nature? Is this "the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, *which is Christ in you*, the hope

of glory?" Is the new life only the old life of man in his originally perfect state? We think not. Yet we would rather assume the attitude of earnest inquiry than of dogmatic assertion. The Scriptures appear to us to point to something higher, something far more transcendent, something so stupendous in its kind, that like the incarnation of the Son of God, of which it is the product, no analogy to it shall be found in the illimitable domain of creative power. A new order of being is introduced into the universe, sustaining relations to the Godhead through the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, which exalts it immeasurably above the highest of the heavenly hierarchies.

" They never sunk so low,
They are not raised so high;
They never knew such depths of woe,
Such heights of majesty.
The Saviour did not join
Their nature to his own;
For them he shed no blood divine,
Nor breathed a single groan."

The body of the redeemed sinner is not simply restored to the pristine vigor, beauty, and incorruptibility of that part of his complex nature. A loftier destiny awaits it. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The body of the raised and glorified saint is not the natural body restored to its primeval perfection. It passes into a higher sphere of existence. It is raised a *spiritual* body. "For our conversation (commonwealth?) is in heaven; from whence also, as Saviour, we wait for the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall transform the body of our humiliation [so that it be] conformed to the body of his glory." Phil. iii: 20, 21. What the body of his glory is we are taught by the vision of Peter, and James, and John, on the Mount of transfiguration. They were "eye-witnesses of his majesty," his "honor and glory"—a glory surpassed only by "the excellent glory" from which the voice issued. If the reader will compare, in the original, the passage from Philippians quoted above, the account of the transfiguration in Luke, and Peter's reference to that remarkable event in the first chapter of his second epistle, he will hardly fail to

conclude that in that august transformation of the Saviour's bodily appearance, we have the type of our own in the great day of his second coming. We are "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." When that day comes, the redeemed body of the saved sinner likewise will "shine as the sun." It will assume a glory conformed to that of the highest type of glorified materialism, even the glorified body of the exalted Mediator. Before the spiritual body, all other glories of the material universe will "pale their ineffectual fires." All intelligent beings will wonder and adore, as they gaze upon this crowning exhibition of the glory of God in the glorified body of the redeemed. It will be the sublimest visible work of Almighty power. It will be instinct with a vital energy, with an activity and endurance vastly transcending every other manifestation of physical life. Spiritualized matter, materialized spirit—so ethereal will it be that it shall seem to combine in itself the two substances which comprehend the universe of being.

Now, if the body is the subject of a change so wonderful and glorious, it is altogether congruous that the soul should undergo an analogous change; that it should make an advance in the scale of being all but infinite. Nothing less will adapt it to that ethereal materialism which the plastic hand—not of nature, but of grace and power divine—has molded out of priceless dust, and garnished with imperial splendor for its future and everlasting dwelling-place. Nothing less can be the result of a vital union of the soul to the incarnate Son of God, who is the Lord of life and glory. For, let it be observed, it is a *vital* union. This was not the original relation of the soul of man to God, in Paradise. It could not be. This vital union presupposes the fall, the incarnation, and the drawing of the soul to Christ by the Father, through the Spirit.

The intimate relation constituted by the vital union between the soul and the Godhead, through Christ Jesus, as has already been remarked, exalts it immeasurably above the highest of angelic natures. The paternity of God in their case is grounded in the act of creation; in the case of the redeemed, in the act of begetting. The angels were created by an act of almighty power, energizing itself, so to speak, altogether extrinsic to the great Creator; redeemed sinners are *born* of the Spirit, and,

according to the law of the Spirit of life, being in Christ, the head of descent, as well as covenant, as his spiritual seed. Those are segregated one from the other, having no affiliation by natural descent, and no relation whatever to each other except what springs from a oneness of order; these, with their adorable Head, constitute the *family* of God. Christ, who is also their elder brother, is the only begotten Son of the Father, and they are begotten of the Father through the Son, by the operation of the Spirit, which proceedeth from the Father and the Son. They are all born of the Spirit—born of God.

The purposes of Jehovah in the redemption of men are as various as marvelous. Some of them are obvious on the pages of revelation; others are obscurely hinted at, or revealed only in outline; and others still, no doubt, lie hid in the fathomless depths of the eternal counsels. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing." It is so in nature, providence, and grace. The scenes of nature lie open to our view, and we can not look around us without beholding, along with the works themselves, the manifold traces of the matchless power, wisdom and goodness, whence they sprang. But there are profound mysteries in nature—mysteries that elude the utmost efforts of philosophy. By a careful induction of particular facts we ascend to general laws; and by a wider generalization we reduce these general laws to one still more general. We advance step by step; but as the light extends, the wider becomes the sphere of surrounding darkness. As knowledge increases, so increases the conviction of ignofance. We catch a glimpse here and there of a fitful ray, penetrating the circumambient gloom; but it is like the lightning's flash—seen and gone. Whichever way we turn, a dark and impenetrable veil circumscribes our view. All above, beneath, around us, is still replete with mystery. We catch a note here and there of the mighty harmonies of nature; but its lofty anthem of praise to Jehovah of Hosts never vibrates on mortal ear. We seize a hint here and a hint there in our investigations, enough to show there is a principle of unity in nature whereby all is bound together, and linked fast to the throne of God; but who can enter her secret chambers and reveal to mortals the primordial law of her being? And then, passing by laws and forces, what do

we know, what can we know of substance? of matter or spirit? A like glorious concealment invests the scheme of Divine Providence. Slowly the complicated drama moves onward, evolving the counsels of the Eternal Mind; yet how small a part of his ways do we understand? At every turn of the mighty wheel on earth who is not ready to exclaim with the prophet Jeremiah, "Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments: Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?" Some light, indeed, sufficient for our disciplinary state, beams upon the mysterious course of things from the page of revelation; and where it fails, faith rests in the wisdom, rectitude, and goodness of the Divine Being in the government of the world. Yet, how constantly is the conviction forced upon us, "He maketh darkness pavilions round about him, dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies." Verily, great is the glory of God in concealing a thing! And when we examine the economy of grace and redemption, mingled obscurity and brightness envelop the awful facts revealed to faith. We are expressly informed that the Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us. The Second Person of the Godhead became Immanuel, God with us. *His* blood cleanseth from all sin. Yet what unutterable obscurity hangs around the constitution of the person of our Immanuel! The two natures not identified! their respective properties not confounded! yet by their ineffable union constituting the person of the Redeemer of God's elect—at once the brightest glory and the profoundest mystery of the universe! How incomprehensible! What an awful grandeur, what inexplicable wonders, invest the primal fact in the history of redemption! "We delight to lose ourselves in the impenetrable shades which invest the subject, because in the darkness and cloud which envelop it God dwells. It is the greatness which forms the mystery of the fact—the matchless love and condescension constitute the very nucleus of the difficulty. It could only be brought within the sphere of our comprehension by a contraction of its vast dimensions, by a depression of its native grandeur. A prostration of it to the level of our feeble

capacities would only render it incapable of being the magnet of souls, the attraction of hearts, the wonder of the universe." * Everywhere in the revelations of the great Jehovah, along with that which is necessary to salvation and easy to be understood, are things hard to be understood—too subtle in their nature, too vast in their proportions, to be defined in language or comprehended in thought.

Of the purposes of God in the amazing incarnation of the Son, in his obedience and atoning sacrifice, in his elevation to the mediatorial throne, some, as already stated, are clearly revealed; others, which it by no means concerns us to know now, "the Father hath put in his own power." Of others we have brief hints, an indefinite outline. It is our privilege to follow these hints, to fill up the outline, so far as the statements and analogies of the word may in any wise warrant. We should not be wise above what is written; but unto that measure we may earnestly strive to attain. In a careful and protracted study of the Divine Word, comparing scripture with scripture, each succeeding generation may add of its inexhaustible riches to the garnered stock of the world's knowledge. There is a *manifold* wisdom in redemption. In it the divine attributes are harmonized; and not only so: redemption is the harmony of the universe. "The economy of the mystery" is as vast as eternity, and in its influence coextensive with the range of intelligent being. It has relations to other orders of intelligences besides the world of mankind. The intimations of this fact are distinct, whatever sacred reserve may enshroud the subject. The incarnation of the Eternal Son, with its immediate fruits—the great sacrifice for sin and the new life imparted to redeemed humanity—appears to lie at the foundation of the gathering together again in one of all things in Christ. The Captain of salvation, made perfect through suffering in bringing many sons unto glory, is the *causa medians* by which the absolute totality of things is restored to its primal harmony. The glorified Saviour, and the glorified children of the everlasting covenant, made like unto him and placed at the very head of the creation of God, constitute henceforth the connecting link between the

* Robert Hall.

Father of all and the universe of created being. The hypostatical union bridges over the immeasurable gulf between the finite and the infinite, the creature and the Creator. It brings them into an intimacy of relation which no finite mind could have conceived, much less executed. For it would be a very inadequate conception of the truth to regard the hypostatical union as a kind of physical junction. It is not simply a laying of the divine and human in the closest juxta-position possible: it is a life-union. The Eternal Son of God and the man Jesus of Nazareth constitute one person; and all believers in the glorified state are perfectly one with and in this one person. They become "partakers of the divine nature;" or, as perhaps the translation should be, "partakers of *a* divine nature." Now it is because the once corrupt sons of Adam become partakers of a divine nature, through the mediation of Jesus Christ their Head, that they become likewise highest in the scale of being after the Infinite himself. They take rank between the Omnipotent and the thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers in the heavenly places. And here, amid these wonders of divine condescension, grace, and power, we may well point again to the redeemed body, resplendent in the glories of a spiritualized materialism. "To a rational being," says President Dwight, "unacquainted with the existence of either angels or men, pure spirits would seem more likely to be a part of the creation of God, than spirits united to bodies; beings wholly rational, than beings partly rational and partly animal. God is a pure spirit. It is not rationally supposed, that, in creating intelligent beings, he would unite them to matter, in such a manner as to form one being of both matter and mind; but it is rationally supposed, that, delighting as he does in his own manner of existence, he would create beings as much like himself as might be. In creating men, a new difficulty concerning existence, a new mystery of philosophy, is presented to our contemplation, viz.: the union of soul and body, so accomplished as to constitute one percipient being." When the foundations of the earth were laid, and the Almighty Architect spread abroad the heavens and garnished them with beauty, and all nature stood out in the freshness of new-born glories, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." In the midst of this

magnificent panorama, man, intelligent man, stood proudly eminent, the lord of all. "I will praise thee," says David, "for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." We may well suppose, then, that man was not lost to the view of the heavenly hosts, amid the vastness of the material universe. On the contrary, as he arose from the dust and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, he became the cynosure of all eyes. All heaven beheld with rapt delight; all hell cast a malignant glance. What ecstatic emotions, then, will thrill the bosoms of these bright sons of the morning, as they gaze again upon the curiously-wrought body of man, now clothed in the beauties of holiness; radiant with the glories of the glorified God-man; dazzling with the brightness that streams from his great white throne; and endued with a divine vigor and immortality! Add to this the knowledge that the spirit which occupies this body is partaker of the divine nature. The convulsions of a dying world; the dissolution and reconstruction of the existing cosmos; the melting of the solid elements with fervent heat; the emergence of the new heavens and the new earth, with other aspects of beauty and magnificence—all this, stupendous as it may be, will attract scarcely a moment's notice. It is but the background of the picture. It is only the stage and its machinery. Jesus and those he brings with him will attract the undivided regard of the universe. "He shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." The mysterious transformation these redeemed ones have undergone, in body and soul, being made like unto him in life and immortality; the matchless dignity among the creatures of God to which they have thereby been exalted: the triumphant manifestation of the economy of grace, in power and glory, as the mighty host gathers and throngs the New Jerusalem, fast by the throne of the Lamb—these are the things which will fill the angelic hierarchies with boundless surprise and admiration. Vast and wonderful indeed will be the change in the framework of nature around them; but how insignificant that in comparison with another that meets their view! The great company which no man can number, with crowns on their heads and palms in their hands!—this will be the wonder of wonders in

the day of wonders—the day of Jesus Christ, for which all other days were made. *He shall be glorified in them.*

The preëminence of the redeemed is most manifestly taught in the visions of the apocalyptic seer. The position they occupy in relation to the throne is conclusive. And this is so, whether we confine the representatives of the church to the “four and twenty elders,” to the exclusion of the “four Beasts” (Living Creatures), or include the latter. For if the living creatures, or living ones, denote the attributes of God, or are emblematic of the nature of the divine government, then the elders stand in immediate contiguity to the throne: no angelic order is interposed. If, however, they, together with the elders, symbolize the church, the preëminence of the redeemed becomes still more emphatic. That the latter is the more probable opinion, if not certainly the true one, appears from Rev. v: 8, 9. Let us now examine the visions bearing on the point in question. Ch. iv: 4: “Round about the throne were four and twenty seats (thrones): and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold.” Ch. iv: 6: “In the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts.” Ch. v: 6: “And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain.” Ch. vii: 11: “And all the angels stood round about the throne and the elders and the four beasts.”

These scriptures establish the fact, that in the everlasting kingdom of Messiah, redeemed sinners hold the highest rank. And well they may. Their oneness of life with him, their participation in a divine nature, entitle them to it. They are in the midst of the throne and round about it. All the angels stand in an exterior circle. Redeemed sinners are made kings and priests unto God. Even as Christ himself is a royal priest and a sacerdotal king, so are they. They “bear the image of the heavenly.” The four and twenty elders sit on as many thrones, clothed in white raiment, and having on their heads crowns of gold. As “in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren,” so the plan of grace is to make them in all things like unto him. And if they are

one with him, it must needs be so. Who, then, of the myriad host of angels could or would dispute preëminence with them.

Here it is in place to offer a suggestion touching the import of the four living creatures of John, which reconciles the two usual interpretations, generically different, and which has an important bearing on the reality of the truth we are endeavoring to establish. The living creatures (unfortunately rendered *beasts* in our translation) are representative of *the divine in the human*—the human being specifically denoted by the four and twenty elders. They are *in the midst* of the throne, *inseparably* connected with it, as well as round about it. The elders are round about the throne, but never said to be in the midst of it. The *Lamb* stands *in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures*, and in the midst of the elders; not in the midst of the throne, and *in the midst of the four living creatures and of the elders*. The throne and the living creatures form an inseparable combination. They are in the midst of the throne, and the throne is in the midst of them; yet they unite with the elders in singing the new song to the Lamb, saying, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." A like intimate relation subsists between the living creatures of Ezekiel and the throne. (It will be remembered that the word rendered living creature in Ezekiel, and that rendered beast in John, are exact equivalents.) Out of the midst of the symbols of a present Deity, first chapter of Ezekiel, "came the likeness of four living creatures, and they had the likeness of a man." "Their appearance," also, "was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of *lamps*: it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning." (When Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham in the plain of Mamre, a smoking furnace and a burning *lamp* were his symbols that passed between the pieces of the victims.) Ezekiel also "heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty." "And above the firmament that was over their heads, was the likeness of a throne; and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. From the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his

loins even downward, I saw, as it were, the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Jehovah." No attentive reader will fail to be struck with the similarity, or rather identity of the characteristics of the living creatures and the glory of Jehovah. While the latter is upon a throne above the firmament, over the heads of the former, both are girdled alike with the divine fire and brightness; and in both the manhood crops out. "They had the likeness of a man," the glory of Jehovah upon the throne, "the likeness as the appearance of a man." In the former the manhood is more distinct. So in the vision of the cherubim (recorded in the tenth chapter), the sound of whose wings was "as the voice of the Almighty God when he speaketh," "There appeared in the cherubims the form of a man's hand under their wings." Here, too, as in connection with the living creatures of the first chapter, we have the throne of sapphire stone in the firmament above the cherubim, and the glory of Jehovah upon it. But the seventeenth verse appears to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these cherubim of the tenth chapter with the living creatures of the first: "For the spirit of the living creature was in them," i. e., in the wheels, which conformed to the movements of the cherubim. And, to make assurance doubly sure, the prophet expressly asserts, in the fifteenth and twentieth verses: "This is the living creature that I saw by the river of Chebar." The reader will also bear in mind the intimate association of cherubim with the Ark of the Covenant, the mercy-seat, and the august symbol of the Divine Presence which rested upon the Mercy-Seat. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews calls them "cherubim of glory." They were of the same material as the mercy-seat, except the latter was of *pure* gold, they of gold. And, which should not be overlooked, it does seem, notwithstanding sharp criticism to the contrary, that they *were fabricated out of the same mass*; ex iaspomet operculo, as the explanatory reading is given in the margin of Michaelis' Hebrew Bible—out of the very cover (mercy-seat) itself. They did not merely rest on the ends of it, but sprang out of them. We do know, Ex. xxxvii: 7, the two cherubim were beaten out of one piece; and if it be objected that that was of gold, while the mercy-seat was of

pure gold, and therefore all could not have been formed out of the same mass, then there must have been a subsequent joining, which gave all the appearance at least of having been formed out of one and the same mass. Nothing less than this will satisfy the fair demands of the sacred record; and this, most probably, was the fact. Compare, in the original, Ex. xxv: 18, 19, with xxxvii: 7, 8. "The cherubim were made out of one piece with the cover" (mercy-seat), says Isaac Leeser, in a brief note on the last verse referred to above. At any rate, there was a real and very close union, not simply a resting of one upon the other. These four—the Ark, the Mercy-Seat, the Cherubim, and the Shekinah resting on the mercy-seat between the cherubim—all closely connected with each other, alone occupied the Holy of Holies. They were the heart, the soul of the Levitical dispensation, and "patterns of things in the heavens." Jehovah dwelt between the cherubim, and they were indissolubly joined to the Propitiatory. The Cloud-Presence rested on the Propitiatory as its throne, while the cherubim, springing out of its ends, stood hard by the Presence, immersed in its rays and reflecting the glory all around.

Now, the conclusion of the whole matter is this: the cherubim of the tabernacle, the living creatures and cherubim of Ezekiel, and the living creatures of John, are all one and the same symbol. They represent the whole company of redeemed sinners in their glorified estate, united in an ineffable and everlasting union to the incarnate Son of God, once slain for them, and afterward exalted to inconceivable majesty and glory on his mediatorial throne—which throne is based on his propitiatory sacrifice; in virtue of which union with him, they become living ones, being partakers of his life, and consequently are sharers of his throne, and invested with a divine energy, power, intelligence, and whatever other attribute in godlike form may be shadowed forth by the cherubic symbolization. That these redeemed sinners are of human kind, is seen in that the living creatures had the likeness of a man, and the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides, and the cherubim the form of a man's hand under their wings; their vast exaltation, in the divinely glorious appearance of both the symbols. In the visions of John, the

association of the four and twenty elders with the living creatures, brings out more distinctly the idea of redeemed humanity—*mankind* as saved—particularly under the two great dispensations of the covenant of grace, after the church militant became a visible, organized body—the kingdom of God on earth. They are round about the throne, not in the midst of it. They are the specific representatives of the fact that redemption proper is of and concerning the human race—that Christ succors not angels, but the seed of Abraham. The living creatures are in the midst of the throne—are resplendent with celestial fire. They are representative of the work of almighty grace and power, completely realized in redeemed and glorified men—the consummation of the life of faith in their perfect life-union in glory with the Lord of glory. These redeemed ones are “angel-like;” nay more, “they are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.”—Luke xx: 36. Their adoption is now complete. They are partakers of *ἀθάνατος* of him who alone essentially possesses it—the blessed and only Potentate, who is King of kings and Lord of lords. They are living ones. The life of him who alone hath immortality pervades their being. “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” The cherubim and the living creatures, then, are representative neither of the attributes of God in the abstract, nor as manifested in the government of the world, but of the attributes of God as realized and manifested concretely in the glorified persons of saved sinners. Neither are they symbolical of any particular part of the heirs of salvation, while the four and twenty elders are symbolical of another part, nor of them in one estate, and the elders of them in another estate; but both together, elders and living creatures, symbolize the entire company of the redeemed from among men in their risen and glorified estate. They are human still, but the human filled with the divine. It is humanity that is redeemed; but humanity, when the redemption is complete, instinct with the in-being and life of divinity.

Recurring now to a remark already made, we repeat, angels could not and would not dispute preëminence with beings exalted to a peerless dignity by reason of a life-union with

Immanuel, the crowned head of universal nature. They could not, because that pre-eminence stands out supremely manifest and indisputable; they would not, because the rectitude of their nature forbids it. Those holy intelligences see and acknowledge things as they are. Envy and jealousy find no access to their pure spirits. In the exercise of meekness and holy obedience, they go forth now "to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." A joyful band of them directed their flight to the forlorn Lazarus, and convoyed his emancipated spirit to the home of the blessed. "In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," and the mighty host of God's elect shall reign in glory with him, in full possession of the great salvation, these lofty and illustrious beings will gladly recognize the fact that the redeemed of the Lord are loftier and more illustrious still than they. The matchless sublimity of that elevation will constitute a prime element in their songs of praise and adoration. But further, it is the express testimony of the Scriptures, that all things, including the angelic orders, were created for Jesus Christ as well as by him. He, Jesus Christ the Mediator, is their last end; and in what sense their last end, we are also told; for all things were created "to the intent that now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." He shall be glorified before them in his saints. And not only so, but we are further informed that the disposition of angels is in perfect accordance with the design of their creation. "Which things the angels desire to look into," says the Apostle Peter. What things? "The sufferings of Christ, and the glory (glories) that should follow." Now connect with this the end of the Saviour's mission, as declared by himself: "I am come that they might have LIFE, and that they might have it *more abundantly*." And the conclusion follows, with absolute certainty, that it is into the glories of this new and abundant life, consequent on the sufferings of Christ, that the angels desire to pry with the intensest curiosity.*

* After the writer of this article had fully excogitated and written out the views presented above, he read, for the first time, the chapter on the Cherubim, in Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture. It is scarcely necessary to say he was gratified at finding his own impressions confirmed by the authority of so emi-

In attempting to develop thus far the gathering together in one of all things in Christ, through his incarnation and death, his consequent and supreme exaltation, and the exaltation of his covenant seed, now in full possession of a new and divine life communicated from him to them, we have reached the following points: Christ is on the throne; around it, and in immediate contiguity, are the ransomed ones of earth; and then the heavenly hosts, searching, in accordance with the design of God in their creation, into the mysteries of the eternal love, and wisdom, and power, and condescension, and grace of Jehovah, as they all blend and shine with transcendent effulgence in the sons of the resurrection, viz., Christ, "the first-born from the dead," and his brethren, partakers of his sufferings, resurrection, life and immortal glory. But is this condition of things permanent? Will the unfallen angels maintain their primeval integrity? Shall the harmony of the universe be disturbed no more by reason of their defection? Reserving for a future consideration the stability of glorified saints, let us see what light the word of God sheds on the future of these original inhabitants of heaven.

That some of their compeers did fall at a period anterior to the fall of man, we do know of a truth; but this was previous to the revelation of the power of the cross, and of the purpose of God to reconcile all things unto himself by the blood thereof. *Elect* angels (so called in contra-distinction to those

nent a biblical scholar. A clause or two of the original he takes the liberty of putting in italics.

"But the information in this line, and by means of these materials (cherubic symbols), reaches its farthest limits, when in the Apocalyptic vision of a triumphant church, the four and twenty elders, who represent her, are seen sitting in royal state and crowned with majesty close beside the throne, with the cherubic forms in and around it. There, at last, the ideal and actual freely meet together—the merely symbolical representatives of the life of God, and its real possessors, the members of a redeemed and glorified church. And the inspiring element of the whole, that which at once explains all and connects all harmoniously together, is the central object appearing there of a 'Lamb, as if it had been slain, in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders.' Here the mystery resolves itself; in this consummate wonder all other wonders cease, all difficulties vanish. The Lamb of God, uniting together heaven and earth, human guilt and divine energy, man's nature and God's perfections, has opened a pathway for the fallen to the very high and pinnacle of created being."

who kept not their first estate), once brought under the attractive power of the cross, are kept steadfast thereby in their allegiance. The peace brought about by the blood of the cross, the reconciliation effected by it, must needs be a permanent one. No other would be worthy of God, or of the means whereby it was achieved. Take away from it this element of permanency; admit that revolt may again throw into confusion the restored harmony of the universe; let sin, discordant and rebellious, again win over heavenly hierarchs, and the glory of the great reconciliation is gone forever. Ichabod is written all over the temple it was the eternal purpose of God to rear to the praise of his own great name. But no such catastrophe is to be apprehended. The majestic cross of Christ stands as an all-sufficient and eternal barrier against it. And by the cross, we mean the efficacious expiation Christ offered for sin as contemplated by admiring and adoring angels in its consummate result, a glorified and triumphant church. "He shall come," we repeat, "to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." There all the perfections of God are exhibited in a form so stupendously grand and imposing, and shine with a lustre so infinitely bright, that the moral effect upon the holy universe is irresistible, and as lasting as the immortal life of the redeemed. The sweet, yet awful wonders of the cross, will never cease to attract the regard of angels. They will desire forever to look into these things. God is love; love is the fulfilling of the law; the love of a dying Saviour shed abroad in the sinner's heart, enkindles undying love to him; and the love of God, as it beams from the cross in undiminished, and relatively, in ever-increasing effulgence, binds the universe together in an eternal harmony. This light of divine love illumines, and transports, and henceforth holds in everlasting fealty all holy beings fast to the throne of heaven. To it we may transfer, with exceeding propriety, Milton's inimitably sublime apostrophe:

"Hail, holy Light, offspring of Heav'n first-born,
Or th' of Eternal co-eternal beam!
May I express thee unblam'd? since God is light,
And never but in unapproach'd light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee,
Bright effluence of bright essence increate."

In the light of the cross finite natures make their nearest approach to the "bright essence increate" of the Infinite. All other manifestations of the Divine Nature are utterly incomparable to this. It is God manifest in flesh, "seen of angels;" and once seen, seen forever, and forever felt in its mighty drawing. The light of the cross will never be withdrawn. Angels will never cease to feel its power. It is the power of God, not only to man, but to the universe as well. Light, and love, and harmony, uninterrupted and unending, divinely bright and pure, are the abiding effluences of the cross. Here at last we find, or rather God discloses to us, an effectual means of securing angels in holiness and blessedness. All the fullness of God dwells in Christ; and saints in glory partake of that fullness, without admixture of corruption. The exhibition of it exerts an irresistibly constraining influence. The power of temptation is broken by it; nay, the very approach of temptation is forbidden by the effulgence of its resplendent glories.

All created intelligences, *ex necessitate rei*, are under law. Upon their creation, the government of God instantly obtains; and stern, inexorable justice, is the rule of its administration. In this condition of things, and in the nature of the case, all that appears necessary to accomplish the fall of any created being, is a sufficient temptation; for he is fallible because finite, and finite because created. Now, temptation, for aught that appears to the contrary, may rise to any degree short of infinite. No finite being, therefore, is able to resist all possible temptation. All are liable to fall, so long as a holy, but finite nature and natural law, are the only elements which enter into the problem of their stability. If one temptation does not conquer, another and a stronger one may. The Infinite alone is secure. It is impossible for God to sin, because he is God, and can not be tempted of evil; and temptation can not become infinite in degree, because God tempteth no one. Some angels fell; man fell; all the angels might have fallen sometime in the endless cycles of duration, had not God interposed. All did not fall with the devil and his confederate legions, either because they did not come within the circle of their temptation, or because they successfully resisted it; but a stronger temptation might have overcome

even them. Those who fell not are the *elect* angels. For them and for fallen men, God did interpose. According to the good pleasure of his will, some men were elected unto everlasting life, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. The angels who kept their first estate, were elected unto a confirmed state of holiness, through the influence of the awfully near approach of the Creator to the creature in the redemption of elect men. "*At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.*" Yes, and all the angels of God shall know that mysterious, awful truth—shall *see* it, and feel its mighty power forever. The stupendous mysteries of the in-being of God in man, will exercise their vast powers as eternity rolls on; and their high hallelujahs burst forth ever new as these mysteries unfold themselves to their adoring contemplation. The matchless, the consuming holiness of God revealed therein, will bar not only the entrance of sin itself, but every temptation to sin. How awful goodness is!

Thus the harmony of the universe is restored and secured by the cross. Men and angels are at one again, and join their voices in unceasing praises to the everlasting Head of the new heavens and the new earth. The Son is glorified, and the Father is glorified in the Son. All is to the glory of God. The grand purpose of redemption is completely realized.

Following the hints given in the Scriptures of truth, of the great purpose God is pursuing in the redemption of mankind, to wit, to bring the whole universe of intelligent beings (with the exception of the fallen angels and that portion of our race who shall be eternally lost), into one harmonious and perfect empire under the scepter of Jesus Christ, we have endeavored to show how that purpose is effected by means of the cross. It is by imparting to the elect of earth a new and divine life derived from the second Adam, whereby, in the language of Dr. Fairbairn, they are exalted *to the very height and pinnacle of created being*. The elect of heaven, in consonance with the design of God in their creation, recognize this proud preëminence; and amid the supreme and everlasting manifestations of the divine holiness revealed therein—blazing upon them with a splendor inconceivably majestic and efficacious—they are secured not only against the power, but the

very approach of temptation. It is necessary now to show that *the gathering together in one of all things in Christ—the great reconciliation*—does refer to such an empire, and can not by a fair interpretation of the Scriptures be narrowed down to the union of Jews and Gentiles in one body in Christ; or, which is equally short of the truth, be restricted to the people of God, some of whom are now in heaven and others still on the earth, and who are all at last to be brought together to the heavenly inheritance. That redemption, in its strictly technical sense, is confined to sinners of the human race, is readily admitted, but this by no means excludes the notion of its having relations to other creatures of God. What these relations are, and how angels participate in the benefits of redemption, have been pointed out. The illustrious Calvin well remarks: “What hinders us from saying that the angels also have been *gathered together*? Not that they were ever scattered, but their attachment to the service of God is now perfect and their state is eternal. What comparison is there between a creature and the Creator without the interposition of a Mediator? So far as they are creatures, had it not been for the benefit which they derived from Christ, they would have been liable to change and to sin, and consequently their happiness would not have been eternal. Who, then, will deny that both angels and men have been brought back to a fixed order by the grace of Christ? Men had been lost, and angels were not beyond the reach of danger. By *gathering* both in his own body Christ hath united them to God the Father, and established actual harmony between heaven and earth.” And again: “It was, however, necessary that angels also should be made to be at peace with God; for, being creatures, they were not beyond the risk of falling, had they not been confirmed by the grace of Christ. This, however, is of no small importance for the perpetuity of peace with God, to have a fixed standing in righteousness, so as to have no longer any fear of fall or revolt.” He even carries his views so far as to add: “Farther, in that very obedience which they render to God, there is not such absolute perfection as to give satisfaction to God in every respect and without the need of pardon.”

We now give, in the authorized English version, the chief proof-texts relied on to sustain our idea of the extent of the

Saviour's work, though our criticisms will necessarily be on the Greek text:

Eph. i: 9 and 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him." Eph. i: 20-23: "Which (the working of his mighty power) he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

Col. i: 16-20: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preëminence. For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all fullness dwell: and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things in earth, or things in heaven."

See also Phil. ii: 6-11.

These scriptures teach with perfect clearness (1), that Jesus Christ is our Mediator, and as such, is elevated to the throne of universal dominion. He is the supreme ruler of the universe. *All* power in heaven and in earth is *given* unto him. He is the head of *all* principality and power, angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him. Indeed, this proposition is announced so frequently, and in terms so perspicuous, that it is quite unnecessary to multiply proofs. It may be remarked, however, that the obedience of the heavenly intelligences to Messiah as their king, is not a constrained obedience, but a willing, filial, spontaneous recognition of his claims, and a glad acquiescence of, his rule. (2.) This exaltation

of Messiah the Prince is in consequence of his incarnation and death—the reward of his humiliation and sufferings. “Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory.” The officiating priest becomes a sceptered king. He passes from the altar to the throne. His kingdom is his glory and his reward. But the special object now in hand is to show (8), that these scriptures teach the sovereignty of Jesus Christ over the universe, which is not established by a mere arbitrary act of almighty power, but is brought about through the influence of the cross; that the redemptive work of the Saviour *has* relations to other beings than men. And whether we have succeeded or not in pointing out the precise method whereby the cross harmonizes the universe, it is important to settle it as a fact revealed in the word of God, that the direct sweep of its influence is not confined to mortal or immortal men. It is something more than material creations and natural laws, which excite to praise and adoration as intelligent beings behold in them the wisdom, power, and goodness of God. It is a direct and positive power, a controlling influence in the realm of mind. It is the touchstone of fealty to the great Jehovah, and the sure pledge of eternal life to all the elect of God, whether angels or men. The Lamb in the midst of the throne is the admiration and the hope of the universe. The efficacy of his sacrifice is infinite in degree and limitless in extent.

No one can fail to be struck with the universality of the terms used in these texts or the uniformity of that usage. The obvious sense, therefore, of the expressions ought to be accepted, unless the context, or the proportion of faith, or the nature of the subject itself, necessarily imposes limitations. The generalizing neuter *τὰ πάντα* is not decisive of itself, it is true, as it may always be limited by the subject-matter of discourse; yet even in such a passage as Gal. iii: 22, the propriety of restricting it absolutely to human kind, may be questioned. Human kind certainly is the chief constituent of the *τὰ πάντα* there, but may it not be intended to embrace also the whole mundane sphere of things of which man is the lord? What Paul says of the *πίστεως* in the eighth of Romans, gives no little plausibility to such an opinion. There is a profound depth of meaning in the divine word which we are in

constant danger of overlooking. When, however, τὰ πάντα is supplemented by the addition of τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, the absolute totality of created existence must be intended—all beings and things whatsoever and wheresoever—with the exception of fallen angels and the finally impenitent of mankind. This limitation the proportion of faith imperatively requires, the Scriptures constantly teaching that they are to be shut up in hell forever. After a careful examination we find that τὰ πάντα followed by the clause cited above, occurs three times in the New Testament—all in the passages quoted from Ephesians and Colossians.* Once that clause follows πᾶσα πατριὰ (Eph. iii: 15), once πᾶν χρίσμα (Rev. v: 13), and once πᾶσα ἐξουσία (Matthew xxviii: 18). These are all the instances in which it follows πᾶς either alone or joined to a substantive. Heaven and earth in the Greek are found sometimes with, sometimes without the article, belonging to that class of nouns with which it is allowable to omit it. Now, what can be the object in appending this clause to τὰ πάντα? Most manifestly to show that it is not, as in Gal. iii: 22, to be limited by the context. It is to guard against the very error into which they fall who urge, whatever be the reason, that it is limited. And what seems to prove this conclusively is the fact that *heaven and earth, or the heavens and the earth*, is the common formula with the sacred writers to express the totality of created things. There is no more warrant from the *usus loquendi* to apply τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to the two classes of redeemed men, some of whom are in heaven and others still on earth, than to Jews and Gentiles.

In Col. i: 16, there can be no room for doubt, for the following clauses prove the universality of the reference by specifying the two great divisions of the creation—the visible or material, and the invisible or spiritual; and the latter division is itself specified by an enumeration of four particulars. "*Hac distributione universam creaturam complectitur*," says Bishop Davenant. The truth of the remark is as palpable as the sun in the heavens. Now, let any one take up his Greek Testa-

* In Col. i: 20, the parts composing the whole are expressed under the form of correlative disjunction, by *cire—cire*. The effect of this, without altering the sense, is to direct the attention more distinctly to the specific parts of the πᾶς. See I. Cor. xii: 13.

ment, and read on from this verse through the twentieth; and the conclusion, as it appears to us, will be inevitable to every one whose judgment is not warped by a theory which will not admit it, that the *τὰ πάντα* of the twentieth is co-extensive with that of the sixteenth—except as modified in the manner, and for the reason already mentioned. It should be observed, however, that devils and lost men are not permitted to disturb the harmony of things after the reconciliation. They are confined to their own place. In the twentieth verse, the means of the reconciliation of all things unto the Father is interposed between *τὰ πάντα* and its specifying clause; and in that clause the order of the words heaven and earth is transposed. This change of order, whereby earth stands first, occurring as it does directly after the writer has named the blood of the cross as the means of reconciliation, may be intended to indicate, as Ellicott suggests, the closer connection of the death of Christ with the *things upon the earth*. All things were created by Jesus Christ, and all things are to be restored by him; yet to some the cross holds a nearer relation than to others; but all feel its peace-making efficacy. Good angels, it is true, can not be said to be reconciled to God in the sense that penitent sinners are: they were never at enmity with him. Penitent sinners are reconciled from a state of enmity; good angels from the *possibility* of a state of enmity. If not enemies in esse, they are in posse. The reconciliation in their case marks, not a change of character, but a change of relation. But the whole difficulty arising from the use of the term reconciliation vanishes, if we admit that what is here spoken of is not the reconciliation of the *τὰ πάντα*, considered as one party, to God, considered as the other; but the restoration of harmony between the different parts of the universe itself. Sin has set them at variance one with another. Deadly strife now rages. Peace is made through the blood of the cross. The determination of this point depends upon the construction we put upon *εἰς αὐτόν* (or, as others read, *αὐτόν*) in the twentieth verse. Does it refer to God as one of the parties between whom reconciliation is effected? We venture to assert, with some degree of confidence, that it does not. With the aid of Bruder's Concordance we have examined every passage where the verb *ἀποκαλλάττειν* and the simpler *καλλάττειν* and

καταλλάττειν occur, and in every instance (unless the one now under consideration be an exception), the party to whom one is said to be reconciled, is put in the dative after them, without a preposition. In two instances neither substantive nor pronoun marks the remote object. In one, Rom. v: 10, the dative is necessarily supplied by the mind from the preceding clause: the other is Col. i: 21. So far as the limited means at hand enable us to determine, the compound form *ἀπό* does not occur in the Greek classics; but *καταλλάττειν* and *διαλλάττειν*, to reconcile, as in the New Testament, are followed by the dative of the remote object, or by the accusative with *πρός*, not *εἰς*. We request the reader to examine for himself the passages in the New Testament. Ellicott, while maintaining the wide sense of the phrase "to restore (reconcile) all things," translates *εἰς ἑαυτόν*, unto himself, and considers it a case of the *constructio praeagnans*. But how so? If the regular construction is to put the remote object in the dative after these verbs, as we have seen, how can the insertion of *εἰς*, followed by the accusative, give the additional idea of "union with?" Moreover, the union is with Christ—not with God: it is in him that all things are gathered together in one and reconciled. As for the word "access" which he brings in from Eph. ii: 18, it is enough to say there is no "access" here, except what would be implied with either construction in the idea of reconciliation—and no *constructio praeagnans* there. The critical scholar can read his note and the reference to Winer, and then decide for himself. What, then, is the sense of *εἰς ἑαυτόν*? The same as in the sixteenth verse—for himself. It designates the last end of the reconciliation. All things are reconciled in and under "the Son of his love," to the glory of the Father.* The reconciliation is unto the Father as the end of it.

An argument for the universality of the reconciliation referred to in Col. i: 20, may be drawn also from the verse

* We write *Father*, not *God*, designedly, in order to indicate that the grammatical subject of *ἐξόμωσαν*, in the nineteenth verse, is *Father*, continued from the twelfth verse—not *Χριστός*, nor *θεός*, nor *πλήρωμα*. The intermediate verses describe the character and works of the Son. Such appears to have been the opinion of our translators also, though they have apparently (perhaps, however, only apparently) treated the verb as impersonal. Compare the translation here with that of I. Cor. i: 21. This verb is always personal in the New Testament.

following. Undoubtedly that appears to be the application of a general truth to the special case of the Colossians.

We call attention next to the passage where the phrase, *in heaven and upon earth*, follows *πάντα πατρίᾳ*.—Eph. iii: 15. *Εξ οὗ πάντα πατρίᾳ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται*. Does this mean, "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named (Eng. Ver.)? or, from (*i. e.*, after) whom every family (race) in heaven and on earth is [*thus*] named?—*i. e.* named *α πατρίᾳ*—a race. For this simple interpretation of *ὀνομάζεται*, which avoids all interpolations after it, and all arbitrary renderings of it, we are indebted to Ellicott, who himself accredits it to Meyer. Every race has the name *πατρίᾳ* given to it, because every race alike is the offspring of the universal *Πατήρ*. If this interpretation, as natural and intelligible as it is simple, be adopted, it settles everything else. And confirmatory of it, is the fact that wherever the word *πατρίᾳ* is used in the New Testament, it is associated with *πατήρ* itself, or with the name of some *πατήρ*. Here, it is *τον πατέρα*, the Father—the great Father of all. But without insisting further on this point at present, let us pass on. Every Greek scholar knows that to justify the rendering of *πάντα πατρίᾳ* given in the English version, the article ought, according to the ordinary rule, to be inserted. Several reasons are assigned for neglecting the rule in this instance, which will be noticed in what follows. But this is not the only difficulty of a like nature, though commonly the only one adverted to. For, if the phrase following *πατρίᾳ* is descriptive of the whole family as divided at present into two classes, one in heaven and the other upon earth, the article should stand before both *ἐν* and *ἐπὶ*. And not only so, but if the apostle intended to point out these two coördinate divisions conceived of as constituting one whole, we should look for the particle *καί*, or an additional *καί*. See Jelf, §758, and Winer, Sect. LIII., 4. With these emendations, and overlooking the omission of the article with *πάντα*, the verse would read, "Of whom the whole family, both that (division of it) in heaven and that (division of it) on earth, is named." All would then be perspicuous; and had the apostle intended to express the idea conveyed in our version, he would certainly have been more explicit. After devoting more than thirty years to the study of New Testa-

ment diction, Winer renders the following judgment as the result of his protracted and matured labors: "Explicitness is characteristic of later Greek in general, and of the New Testament in particular." But the truth is, the omission of the article before *παρὰ* is decisive. The Rev. T. S. Green (Gram. of the N. T. Dialect, p. 195), lays down the rule as follows: "When a singular noun, except such as are strictly abstracts, and proper names, has the article, *πᾶς* must be rendered 'the whole;' when the singular noun is anarthrous, it signifies 'every.'" For an illustration of both usages, in a single verse, see Rom. iii: 19. Where the difference caused by the omission or the insertion of the article is so great, it may well be supposed that a corresponding carefulness is observed. Such is indisputably the fact. A more unvarying rule of construction than the one cited above can not be found.* Winer, referring to the passage now under discus-

* A careful inspection of every passage where *πᾶς* occurs in Paul's epistles (including Hebrews), and indeed of nearly all the New Testament, with direct reference to the verification of this rule, convinces the present writer that it is well founded—that there are absolutely no exceptions to it. The only case of real difficulty is found in Eph. ii: 21; but here some of the critical editors retain the article. Griesbach does not remove it from the text, and it is found in at least two of the most ancient and valuable codices. Bloomfield inserts it, affirming that the external testimony is *not against* it, and the internal all *in favor* of it. Scholz retains it. Being at best, therefore, a doubtful case, Eph. ii: 21 may fairly be set aside in determining the authority of Green's rule. The four cases to the contrary, cited by Eadie, are wide of the mark. *Πάντα πειρασμὸν* (Luke iv: 13), means *every temptation*—every form or species of temptation, and exactly corresponds to the facts recorded in the sacred narrative. *Πάνη σοφία Αἰγυπτίου* (Acts vii: 22), omitting the consideration that it is an abstract noun, means in *every branch of Egyptian wisdom*—*πᾶς* denoting *extension* rather than *intensity*. The other two (Matt. ii: 8, and Acts ii: 36) come under the head of proper names. For the last, see Winer and Green. But it is idle to attempt to show that *παρὰ* may be classed with proper names. *Πᾶσα γραφή* (2 Tim. iii: 16), which Eadie might have cited with more propriety, means *every scripture*.

In the notes appended to the translation of Ephesians, issued by the American Bible Union, are references to justify rendering *πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ* (without the article), in Eph. ii: 21, *the whole building*; but in all of them *πᾶς* is in the plural.

In connection with *πᾶς*, abstract nouns are found both with and without the article, but with different shades of meaning. *τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν* (1 Tim. i: 16) is the totality of long-suffering, *every conceivable manifestation of it aggregated and concentrated in the Saviour's dealing with Paul*: *ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ* (2 Tim. iv: 2), is in (with) *every exhibition or manner of long-suffering*. The last is analo-

sion, says, "*πᾶσα πατριὰ obviously means every race.*" It is so clear to the mind of this eminent scholar, as not to admit of a doubt. Middleton's testimony is of the same purport. Indeed, if any question at all of construction may be allowed to be settled by the laws of language, this is one. The second rendering, therefore, of the whole verse, as given above, is, beyond all reasonable doubt, correct. Aside from the extreme probability that the words (v. 15) of our Lord Jesus Christ are an interpolation, the evident paronomasia between *πατέρα* and *πατριὰ* shows plainly enough that the former is the antecedent of the relative *ὃς*. It is to the universal Father, from whom every *πατριὰ* is so named, that Paul bows his knees. True, he approaches him through the mediation of Jesus Christ, in whom he is the Father of all penitent and believing sinners; and through whom the paternal relation between him and them is reestablished, so that man again becomes really one of the many *πατριά* of his rational creatures. So far, then, is this view of the verse from destroying its harmony with the context, that it adds immensely to the dignity and scope of the whole. Grammar and exegesis are not at issue. On the contrary, grammar does not allow, neither does the context require, the rendering of the authorized version. The conclusion, therefore, to which we come—the special point we have had in view all along—is that the phrase *in heaven and on earth* is used here, as elsewhere, to denote universality. Every family in the universe is so named from the common Father of all.

There can be no dispute about the meaning of this phrase in Rev. v: 13, where it follows *πάνν κτίσθρα*. It can mean nothing but the universe; and all the more manifestly so, if possible, by reason of the strengthening additions. As little dispute can there be about its meaning in Matt. xxviii: 18, where it follows *πᾶσα ἐξουσία*: "All power is given unto me in

gous to a frequent use of the plural of abstract nouns in Latin, and of *omnis* with the singular, giving a concrete application to the abstract noun. *Ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ* (Eph. i: 8), with deference to the high authority of Winer, is *in every kind of wisdom*—not "full" wisdom, but *manifold*—according to the sense of *πᾶς* noted above. The same may be said of *πᾶσα ἐξουσία* (Matt. xxviii: 18); it is *every kind of authority*, executive, legislative and judicial. See also Acts v: 23, and I. Tim. i: 15, and apply the same principle.

heaven and on earth." These, with Eph. i: 10, are all the instances in which it is preceded by $\pi\alpha\varsigma$; and all in which it occurs at all, except in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi: 10, and Luke xi: 2), where $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is not the simple grammatical copula, but is employed "as strictly a comparative particle" (Winer, liii: 5), or in the sense of *also*, the comparative particle correlative to $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ being supplied.

Turning now to Eph. i: 10, and carrying along the result of our investigations into the import of $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ following the universal term $\pi\alpha\varsigma$, it does seem arbitrary in the extreme to affirm that here one term of that phrase points out the present locality of one portion of the redeemed, and the other the locality of another portion. How perfectly easy was it to avoid all ambiguity! If the apostle had it in mind to predicate the *gathering together* in one of believers only—of no body else and nothing else—how natural for him to write *all those that believe*, instead of *all things in heaven and on earth*! Explicitness demanded it. The very terms used are adapted to mislead; and instead of being corrected by comparing scripture with scripture, the error is confirmed thereby. It will be conceded, nay, it is conceded, that $\delta\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ signifies to *gather together again* in one—the distinct force of $\delta\upsilon\delta$ being retained; and, preserving the power of the middle voice, to *gather together again* in one *for himself*—the middle voice here having the effect, though with a subdued force, of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ in Col. i: 20. In its complete meaning, this verb points back to a previous state of unity; contemplates an existing state of severance and dispersion; and points forward to a future reconstruction. The existing dissevered condition of things, it must be admitted, too, is one that relates chiefly to the moral state of rational creatures, unless we choose to ignore the evident spirit of the divine Word. They are not at one now because sin separates them. Remove it, and all would move on together harmoniously; would be truly united, though living in worlds divided by countless leagues of space. These *moral* ideas are associated at once in the mind of every attentive reader of the Scriptures, with a dividing or a gathering and reconciling of moral beings. And so of the future reconstruction; surely it does not find its grand consummation in bringing either a part or the whole of the righteous

universe into one dwelling-place. The intervention whereby the primal unity is restored is by moral means, and to moral ends. And yet we are told that the whole truth the apostle was commissioned to reveal, when by the Spirit he indited this verse, is, that at some future period, called the fullness of times, God will gather together the entire company of redeemed men, some of whom are now in heaven and others still on earth, into one undivided family—i. e., into the same local abode! Can it be that this is all the truth contained in this great utterance, which commences so majestically in the ninth verse, and ends with what has been proved to be, in every other instance, an emphatic addition to the ordinary term for universality? It were far more probable (if a restriction must be imposed on his language), looking at the manner in which the same apostle elsewhere speaks of the union of Jews and Gentiles in church fellowship, that he speaks of that event here also.

But let us look distinctly at this theory in the light of what is necessarily implied in the definition of *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*. (1). It implies a previous state of unity. But there was no original unity among the redeemed of the Lord, either moral or local. As unconverted sinners, they were alienated one from another, as well as from God; and were separated both in time and place. As regenerated men, they were never gathered together in one except as they are all one in Christ; and they are that to-day as really as they ever will be. There never was a local union of them. This theory, therefore, fails to meet the demand of the definition in the first point. (2). The definition implies an existing condition of severance and dispersion. But all the redeemed are one body in and under Christ this present hour; always have been, and always will be. The same is true of them at any period in the history of redemption, from the beginning to the consummation of ages. And just so far as the great work of the Mediator terminates on the condition of ransomed sinners, the mystery and greatness and glory of the divine purpose converge at this very point; they are each and all united to their living Head, and thus have union and communion one with another, and together constitute one body, even the mystical body of Christ. It is an intense lowering of the dignity and grandeur

of the union of all believers, to put forward so prominently the idea of contiguity. Whatever of reality there may be in such a union, it is after all but the outward expression of that which is inward and spiritual, and which gives value and significance to the outward. Furthermore, the whole context proves that the apostle is dealing with the spiritual realities of redemption. Relations in space are lost sight of in the surpassing glory of spiritual and eternal relations, established, as we believe, between the various races of rational beings. Again: in passages analogous to Eph. i: 9, 10, where the same apostle treats of the privileges bestowed on the Gentiles by the Gospel, it is evident he refers to their incorporation with the true Israel—Israel after the Spirit. See Eph. iii: 3-6. The union, therefore, is not of the kind they contend for who restrict the apostle's language to mankind; and if so, there is not an existing separation such as a *regathering* implies. Believers, both those in heaven and those on earth, are one body *now*. (3). If the views just presented be correct, neither can there be any proper reconstruction after men are once united to Christ in their effectual calling. *That* would be the gathering together again in one, whether the previous unity be conceived of as existing among men themselves in the loins of Adam before the fall, or between them and God. It is demonstrable, therefore, as it seems to us, that this theory of a union of all believers in one local habitation, meets neither the fair demands of what is implied in the verb ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, nor of the context.

It is worthy also of very particular notice, that the apostle does not say, "To gather together again in one all things *that are* in Christ?" Hence, the argument derived from the fact that believers alone are ever said to be *in Christ*, falls to the ground. Were ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ an attributive of τὰ πάντα, perspicuity would require the insertion of τα, or τὰ ὅντα, before ἐν in a case like this, even if it could be fairly claimed as an exception to the general rule. See Winer, sec. xx. It ought to be observed, too, that Χριστῷ has the article. The common formula, upon which the argument hinges, is simply ἐν Χριστῷ. The truth is, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is to be joined to the verb—not to τὰ πάντα; and what the apostle asserts, is that it is the purpose of God that all things, in the fullness of times, shall be

gathered together again in one in the Christ. All things are to be reunited in *Him* precisely in the sense in which they were originally created in Him (*ἐν αὐτῷ*). Col. i: 16. "He is the creative center of all things, the causal element of their existence; the *causa conditionalis*—the act of creation being supposed to rest in Him, and to depend on Him for its completion and realization." (See Ellicott in loc., and Winer, sec. xlviii, pp. 406-8, d, and note 3, on p. 407.) So Christ is the causal element of the regathering of all things—the act of regathering being supposed to center in Him as the causal element of its realization. We close these criticisms with simply calling attention to the two following remarks: 1. As the regathering in Ephesians is manifestly a reuniting of the different parts of the universe to *each other*, without, of course, excluding the idea that all as one whole are reunited to God; so the reconciliation in the parallel passage in Colossians, it may be argued analogically, is a reconciliation of the various races and orders of the universe, and not one between them collectively as one party, and God as the other. 2. If the verb *to reconcile* must be construed in its strict theological sense, and if the reconciliation is unto God as an offended party, and if by *the things in heaven* be meant the souls of the redeemed, then, how can they be said to be reconciled unto God? The very reason why they are in heaven now is because they were reconciled to Him before they left the earth.

In the final scheme of things, therefore, as ordained of God, and revealed in the Scriptures, and as the consummate result of the mediatorial intervention of the incarnate Son, in its august and universal sweep—we find as the grand center of the whole, the throne of God and the Lamb. Next, circling round and hard by the throne, and most mysteriously allied to it as partakers of a divine nature and instinct with the life of Christ, are the redeemed of the Lord. Next, according to their rank, come the angels, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands. All constitute one perfect and harmonious empire. The devil and his angels, with the finally impenitent of mankind, are confined in the prison-house of perdition. They shall no more go forth to disturb the harmony of Messiah's kingdom. Universal concord reigns forever. Sin shall no more blast the happiness or the happy

fellowship of the blessed. We call this order of things *final*, and have assumed elsewhere that the kingdom of Messiah, thus constituted in its completed estate, is an everlasting kingdom. Now it is inchoate—in a formative condition. It will be finished when the last one of the elect is gathered in and glorified. It is not in place here to discuss the question of its permanency.

In the preceding part of this essay, we have endeavored to comprehend the following particulars: (a,) to state what the commonly accepted opinion of the New Life is, and, by way of contrast, to state as distinctly as the nature of the case admits, what it really is; (b,) to remove the objection derived from the mysterious nature of it; (c,) to show that the change involved in it is but analogous to the transformation which we do know the human body undergoes at the resurrection; (d,) to show that the idea of it herein set forth, is presented in the symbols of the Old and New Testaments; and lastly, (e,) to show that it is the purpose of God through the influence of the cross, manifested with supreme glory and efficacy in the divine life of glorified men, to confirm the elect angels, and out of the elect of heaven and earth—reconciled and gathered together again in one—to constitute one harmonious and everlasting empire whose head is the Lamb. In the subsequent part, we shall aim to exhibit the more direct proofs of such a new life, and to show its relations to other doctrines “which are most surely believed among us.”

ERRATA.

The reader will please correct the following Errata in our article on Imputation, in the December number:

On page 547, l. 14, for *Francke* read *Fränker*.

P. 561, l. 11 for *cause of* read *cause or*.

P. 568, l. 6, for *by his* read *of his*.

P. 566, l. 6, for *corruption* read *conception*.

P. 567, l. 2 from bottom, for *these* read *thus*.

P. 568, l. 1, for *will* read *with*.

P. 570, l. 8 of note, for *Sac* read *Sec*.

P. 571, l. 23, for *where* read *when*.

P. 572, l. 11 from bottom, for *through* read *though*.

P. 573, l. 20, after *And* read *we*.

P. 576, l. 10, for *facts* read *parts*.

P. 577, l. 9, for *views* read *view*.

